

The Prophets Agree

Biblical Interpretation Series

Editors-in-Chief

Paul Anderson (*George Fox University*)
Jennifer L. Koosed (*Albright College, Reading*)

Editorial Board

A. K. M. Adam (*University of Oxford*)
Colleen M. Conway (*Seton Hall University*)
Nijay Gupta (*Portland Seminary*)
Amy Kalmanofsky (*Jewish Theological Seminary*)
Vernon Robbins (*Emory University*)
Annette Schellenberg (*Universität Wien*)
Johanna Stiebert (*University of Leeds*)
Duane Watson (*Malone University*)
Christine Roy Yoder (*Columbia Theological Seminary*)
Ruben Zimmermann (*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*)

VOLUME 184

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bins*

The Prophets Agree

*The Function of the Book
of the Twelve Prophets in Acts*

By

Aaron W. White



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <http://catalog.loc.gov>
LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2020006064>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0928-0731

ISBN 978-90-04-42627-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-42798-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2020 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense, Hotei Publishing, mentis Verlag, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh and Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

For my wife



Contents

Acknowledgments XI

Abbreviations XIV

Introduction: a Case for a Study on the LXX-Twelve Prophets in Acts 1

- I Flourishing Bones: an Introduction to a Study of the LXX-Twelve Prophets in Acts 1
 - I.a *The Twelve Prophets and Their Presence in the NT* 2
 - I.b *The Twelve Prophets in Acts: a Case for Closer Analysis* 11
- II Previous Work on the TP in Acts and Models of Interpretation 16
 - II.a *"The Exegetes"* 17
 - II.b *The "Conversationalists"* 23
 - II.c *Summary* 35
- III A New Study on the TP in Acts 36
 - III.a *A Dialogue about the Twelve Prophets among Readers* 37
 - III.b *Setting the Stage for the Lukan Use of the Twelve Prophets* 38
 - III.c *The Process of Hearing Each Voice and Its Interaction with the Others* 49
- IV The Argument and the Direction of the Study 51

1 "I Will Pour out My Spirit": Jesus the Lord and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2 54

- The Text of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and of Acts 2:17–21 54
- I Introduction 55
- II "I Will Pour out My Spirit": LXX-Joel 3:1–5 57
- III LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2: God's Attestation of the Lord and His Witnesses 66
 - III.a *The Case of Three Witnesses* 69
 - III.b *Lukan Amendments to LXX-Joel 3:1–5* 71
 - III.c *Luke's Case for Jesus as Lord of the Day of the Lord by Three Witnesses* 73
 - III.d *Summary* 87
- IV Joel 3:1–5 in *The Testament of Judah* 24 88
 - IV.a *An Opening Note on the Context and Its Problems Regarding The Testament of Judah* 88
 - IV.b *A Future Age of Restoration: "After These Things ..."* 90
 - IV.c *The Outpouring of the Spirit upon the Sons of Truth* 92

	iv.d <i>Salvation: "Call upon the Name of the Lord"</i>	93
	iv.e <i>Summary</i>	94
v	Luke and <i>The Testament of Judah</i> 24: a Conversation among Readers	95
2	"Forty Years": the Divided People of God and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43	101
	The Text of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 and of Acts 7:42–43	101
I	Introduction	101
II	"Forty Years": Amos 5:25–27 as a Look Back to the Exodus	103
	II.a <i>Sacrifice or Allegiance to the Lord?</i>	105
	II.b <i>Prototypical Idols from the Exodus in 5:26</i>	106
	II.c <i>Relocation and Exile in 5:27</i>	108
	II.d <i>Summary</i>	109
III	Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43	110
	III.a <i>The Argument: Luke's Reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 as Typology in Acts 7</i>	111
	III.b <i>The Place of the Quotation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Stephen's Speech</i>	113
	III.c <i>"A Prophet Like Me": the Charge of Rejecting God and Moses</i>	115
	III.d <i>"Receiving Living Oracles": the Charge of Rejecting the Customs of Moses</i>	116
	III.e <i>"Rejoicing in the Works of Their Hands": the Charge of Rejecting the Temple</i>	119
	III.f <i>Summary: the Reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43</i>	128
IV	Amos in the Damascus Document: CD-A 7:13–8:1	128
	IV.a <i>The Reading of Amos 5:26–27a in CD-A 7:13–8:1a</i>	129
	IV.b <i>Summary</i>	133
v	Amos 5:25–27 in CD-A and Acts 7: Reading Amos 5 in Community	135
3	"I Am Doing a Work": the Gentiles as God's People and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13	142
	The Text of LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 and of Acts 13:41	142
I	Introduction	142
	I.a <i>A Brief History of Interpretation of LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13</i>	144
	I.b <i>Astonishment at a Turning Point in Redemptive-History: the Argument of This Chapter</i>	146

- II Habakkuk: the Announcement of an Amazing Judgment 147
 - II.a *Lifting the Sights of His Prophet: the Astonishing, Future Work of the LORD* 148
 - II.b *A Universal "Work" of the Lord* 152
 - II.c *Summary: the Universal Plan of the Lord Revealed* 152
 - III The Work of God: the Role of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13 153
 - III.a *"The Work" as the Gospel for the Nations* 154
 - III.b *The Proper Referent of "The Work" as the Gospel for the Nations* 158
 - III.c *Three Observations about the Lukan Paul's Audience(s) and the Mosaic Law* 159
 - III.d *Summary* 165
 - IV "The Traitors in the Latter Days": the Reading of Hab. 1:5 by 1QpHab 1.16–2.10 166
 - IV.a *The Text of 1QpHab. 1.16–2.10* 167
 - IV.b *Reading Habakkuk Apocalyptically: a Battle between Righteous and Evil* 168
 - V Habakkuk 1:5 in 1QpHab and Acts 13: a Conversation among Readers 171
- 4 "All the Gentiles Who Are Called": Sending the Gentile Mission and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15 179**
- The Text of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 and of Amos 15:16–18 179
 - I Introduction 179
 - I.a *The Question Governing the Jerusalem Council and LXX-Amos 9:11–12* 180
 - I.b *The Question of This Chapter: Can't There Just Be a Christian Version of "God-Fearers"?* 183
 - II LXX-Amos 9:11–12: a Rebuilt Davidic Reign in the Eschatological Future 184
 - II.a *The Tent of David and What It Is Meant to Represent* 184
 - II.b *The Nations Seek the Rebuilt Tent of David* 186
 - III LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15: Gentile as Gentile 187
 - III.a *The Eschatological Restoration of the Tent of David* 189
 - III.b *The Rebuilding of the Tent by God* 194
 - III.c *The Tent of David and the Gentiles* 197
 - III.d *Acts 15:18: "Known from of Old"* 204
 - III.e *Summary* 207

- IV Amos 9:11 in 4Q Florilegium Frgs. 1–2 and 21, 1 208
 - IV.a *The Progression from Temple to Dynasty in 4QFlor* 209
 - IV.b *Relating Two “Houses”* 209
 - IV.c *Language of “Raising” of the Eschatological “House” by Two Texts* 209
 - IV.d *Summary* 211
- V Luke and 4QFlor: a Discussion among Readers of Amos 9:11 (and 12) 211

Conclusion: Reading the Greek Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets in Acts 217

- I What Was This Study About? 217
- II Luke and His Co-readers 218
- III How Each Quotation Built towards One Argument 220
- IV What if the Greek Twelve-Prophets Were Not in Acts? 222

Appendix 225

- Selected Texts 225
 - The Testament of Judah *Chapter 24—English Translation* 225
 - CD-A 7:13–8:1—English Translation* 225
 - 1QpHab. 1.16–2.10* 226
 - 4QFlor 1.10–13* 226

Works Cited 228

Index of Sources 243

Index of Authors 252

Index of Subjects 256

Acknowledgments

Because my wife, Sarah White, has supported me in more ways than can be counted, I have been provided with the freedom to study, travel, and meet with colleagues to complete my research. In the truest form, she has imitated the nature of the Holy Spirit, by being my encouragement, helper, and counselor. Sarah, thank you for being patient with the process and supporting me through this season. Your companionship is something that I cannot live without. Additionally, my six kids (Josiah, Wesley, Jameson, Cora, Violet, and Victoria) have been an incredible source of joy during this process. I am especially grateful for my oldest child, Josiah, who has endured my study the longest and encouraged me greatly.

Following my wife comes three other women without whom this project would never have happened. First, my mother, Patty Ferrante. Her love, support, constant presence, and interest in what the LORD is doing in my ministry and research has always been a valuable source of encouragement. Her strength for our family in the face of many struggles has always inspired me. Second, my Grandmother White, who taught me how to pray. Without that seed being planted, I wonder if my interest in the Bible and learning more about Jesus would have ever taken root. Third, and with a special pride-of-place for me, is my Grandmother Frey. She is the patron of my ministry training and research. But more than that, she was my cheerleader and friend. Both grandmothers have passed, but live on in my ministry and research, as a part of their legacy, I hope.

The following work is a revised version of my PhD dissertation. I would now like to thank those who have had a hand in molding me in this process.

First, I would like to thank the faculty of Covenant Seminary, but especially The Rev. Drs. Gregory Perry, Robert Yarbrough, C. John Collins, C. D. “Jimmy” Agan, and David Chapman. Each of these men molded me in unique and essential ways, and each of them shepherded me toward a better understanding of Scripture and a greater interest in interpreting Scripture. Included under this heading, I also want to mention a couple of scholars who have influenced my thinking from afar. First, the late Jacob Jervell’s work on Acts has always inspired me to think harder about what Luke is doing in Acts. I simply feel more creative after reading Jervell. And second, Paul House and his book *The Unity of the Twelve* was the first to introduce me to reading the Twelve Prophets in a new way—not chronologically, but as they appear in our Bibles and in unity. Without this work, I may not have done this research.

This work would not have been possible without the attention of my doctoral advisor, The Rev. Professor John Nolland. John's patient shepherding has developed me into a more precise and more independent thinker. I am also grateful for John's model of scholar-pastor. John, thank you for a model that I can imitate with confidence.

Next, I want to thank the many institutions that have supported my research. First, thank you to Trinity College, Bristol and its staff. Specifically, I am appreciative of the work of Dr. Justin Stratis and the wonderful job he does directing the postgraduate program, Sam Hands as she was always my capable administrative shepherd in this season, and Su Brown who was always willing and able to find me the resources I needed. Next, I am grateful for the kindness that the Pontifical College Josephinum Library (Columbus, Ohio) showed me while doing research there. The library director, Peter Veraka, and his friendly staff were always the definition of helpful and hospitable. Also, my many stays at Tyndale House Library were a point of encouragement and sharpening as I worked through various stages of my research. Thank you to Dr. Peter Williams and to Simon Sykes for making it a restful and edifying time. Finally, thank you to Steve and Anne at Nota Bene, both of whom made the write up of my dissertation an efficient process because of their work with NB.

A special thank you, also, to Professor Francis Watson for being my external examiner. His outside-the-box thinking is stimulating, and his methods are insightful, both of which have influenced my research and writing in significant ways. I am also grateful for Rev. Dr. Stephen Finamore for his work as my internal examiner and the careful attention that he gave my work.

In these final stages of revision, I have been especially grateful for Dr. Paul Anderson for his seasoned advice. He has helped mold the following work into from its dissertation form to a scholarly monograph. Additionally, the Brill team has been invaluable, led by Liesbeth Hugenholtz.

During our time in seminary and through much of our time in doctoral research, my wife and I saw the generosity of many people come to our aid, financially. Space limits me from listing them all here, but we want to say that we are so profoundly grateful for those individuals and families who sacrificially gave so that we could freely and single-mindedly pursue the LORD's calling in our life in ministry and biblical studies research. Thank you!

Thank you, also, to Rev. Daniel Robbins and Ben Church, who have read portions of my dissertation at various stages and have given me feedback on content and prose. Most of all, thank you to Ben Keil, Janine Miller, and Pat Rokusek for proof-reading the entire dissertation from start to finish. I should

note, however, that I claim all remaining errors, and that none of these should be associated with those already mentioned.

Finally, and of great importance, I would like to thank the session and congregation of First Presbyterian Church (EPC), South Charleston, OH, for calling and electing me to be their pastor. Thank you for having confidence in me and my calling, and thank you for cheerfully supporting my “other life” of being an academic.

Aaron W. White

South Charleston, Ohio

Feast of St. Thomas, the Apostle

Abbreviations

Journals, Book Series, and Reference Works

ABD	Freedman, David Noel, ed. <i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
AJT	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BibTod	<i>Bible Today</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
DSSSE	Martinez, Florentino Garcia and Eibert J C Tigchelaar, eds. <i>Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . 2 vols. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997, 1998.
HTS	<i>Harvard Theological Studies</i>
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JPT	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
OTP	Charlesworth, James H., ed. <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985.
PTSDSSP	Charlesworth, James H. <i>Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scroll Project</i> . Vols. 1–3, 4a, 4b, 6b, 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
RBL	<i>Review of Biblical Literature</i>
RQ	<i>Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte</i>
RSR	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
RTP	<i>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</i>
SBS	<i>Stuttgarter Bibelstudien</i>
SE	<i>Studia Evangelica</i>
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>

STDJ	Parry, Donald, and Eugene Ulrich eds. <i>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</i> , vol. 30. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1999.
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WTS	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

A Case for a Study on the LXX-Twelve Prophets in Acts

1 Flourishing Bones: an Introduction to a Study of the LXX-Twelve Prophets in Acts

The way that Luke quotes Scripture continues to be a topic of investigation that captivates many and an issue that proves to reveal more and more about the author of the largest parts of the NT corpus. One rock that has remained unturned in this area is a focused investigation of the function of the Minor Prophets, or Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets (TP), in the book of Acts. In the book of Acts, there are four quotations from the Greek (commonly called the Septuagint or LXX) version of the TP. These are: Joel 3:1–5 [2:28–32 MT] in Acts 2:17–21; Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42b–43; Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41; and Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–18a).¹ Each comes in a speech² at a significant narrative turning point in Acts 1–15.

The Minor Prophets are quoted in Acts at greater length than anywhere else in the NT according to Greek word count. If taken together, Acts stands alone among other NT writings in the way it quotes this OT corpus, unique even to Luke's gospel. For these reasons, among others, great attention should be given to this yet an untouched area of investigation.

-
- 1 It is generally agreed that Luke was an author steeped in Scripture (cf. e.g. Earl Richard, "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts," *NT* 26, no. 1 [1982]: 52–53). When taken together, Luke and Acts accounts for the second most quotations of Scripture in the NT corpus; the Gospel of Luke quotes Scripture 25 times and Acts quotes Scripture on 40 occasions, amounting to 65 quotations in all. The highest number of Scripture quotations is found in the Pauline corpus, totaling approximately 97. The most in one book is 60 in the Epistle to the Romans, and second is the Gospel of Matthew with 54. These totals are according to Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New* (New York: T&T Clark, 2001), 6.
 - 2 It is, in fact, true that the majority of Lukan quotations of Scripture in his gospel and Acts appear in speeches, see I. Howard Marshall, "Acts," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 527. For Acts, all scriptural quotations appear in speeches, except Is. 53:7, 8 which was being read aloud by the Ethiopian Eunuch in Acts 8:32.

This study will take a closer look at the TP as it was read, received, and appropriated by Luke into Acts. We examine what implications the use of the TP in Acts had for the first Christians as Acts portrays this group, and how it may have affected their view of the day in which they collectively stood. The aim is to show that Luke's use of the TP is instrumental in reflecting the early church's view of the universal lordship of Jesus, the Messiah, as it developed from Pentecost to the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15). As it will be borne out, the major turning points marked out by the use of the LXX-TP in Acts 1–15 fulfill the original program set into motion by Acts 1:8 and Acts 2:39. This program is one that those in Jerusalem would accept the lordship of Jesus, followed by “those who are far off” who are at “the end of the earth.”

Furthermore, in this study, strong consideration is given to other voices in the “conversation” made up of other early Jewish texts that are reading the same scriptural texts as Luke. By placing Luke and another exemplar text in locution, we will discern where agreement and disagreement occurs, and what this reveals about the Lukan reading of the Twelve Prophets. An observation of this “conversation” one text at a time will reveal where Luke stands in reference to other readers of Scripture on a shared intertextual plane.

In the end, the primary issue we hope to address by Luke's interaction with other Jewish interpreters and Scripture itself is the function of the Twelve Prophets in Acts. In fact, we will look at the full contribution of the four quotations in Acts by asking: What difference does it make if we read and study the Greek Twelve Prophets as one intertextual contribution to Acts instead of three (where we consider the two Amos quotations as coming from one source) or four? We will propose for the first time that reading the Greek Twelve Prophets as one contribution to Acts will demonstrate its central significance to how we understand the development of the early church and their understanding of Jesus as Lord in Acts, and in a significant way it will build upon our knowledge of Luke's scriptural hermeneutic in his first-century setting.

1.a *The Twelve Prophets and Their Presence in the NT*

In the Lukan milieu, and more broadly that of Jesus, the apostles, and the writers of the New Testament, the Minor Prophets were contained in one scroll, and quite plausibly, they were read as a theologically unified corpus. Ben Sira in his “praise of the Fathers” (Sir. 44ff) implies that a single scroll contained the Twelve Prophets as a unified and identifiable corpus from the second century BCE. This writing that pre-dates the appearance of the TP in the NT says, “May the bones of the Twelve Prophets flourish again where they lie, for they comforted the people of Jacob and delivered them with confident hope”

(Sir. 49:10, NRSV). Though much later, Jerome more definitively said that the Twelve were “one book.”³

The study of the TP has taken a decidedly dramatic turn since the early 1980s, when works such as those of Dale Alan Schneider⁴ and Paul House⁵ began to demonstrate the plausibility of the view that the Minor Prophets were at one time read as one book rather than as twelve individual books.⁶ Due to those studies and others in the 20th and 21st century, the bones of the TP have flourished in OT biblical studies, specifically with reference to plausible unifying theological emphases within the overall corpus⁷ and concerning its potential overall redactional unity (which also raises questions concerning

3 For more on the historical perception of the unity of the Minor Prophets from Jewish to early, medieval, and Reformation-era thinking, to modern critical approaches and interpretations, see Dale A. Schneider, “The Unity of the Book of the Twelve,” unpublished doctoral dissertation (Yale, 1979), 1–17.

4 Schneider, “Unity.”

5 Paul R. House, *The Unity of the Twelve* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990).

6 Others in the modern study of the Twelve Prophets have included, James Nogalski (cf. e.g., James Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993]; James Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993]), and Barry Allan Jones (cf. e.g., Barry A. Jones, *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995]; Barry A. Jones, “The Book of the Twelve as a Witness to Ancient Biblical Interpretation,” in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* [Atlanta: SBL, 2000], 65–74); both giving greater attention to the textual evidence for the redaction of the TP into a single corpus—Nogalski mainly looking at the Hebrew version and Jones focusing more closely on the LXX version, with an eye towards the semi-extant Qumran version. Other important studies exist on this corpus that have made important contributions to the OT and biblical studies communities, respectively, but these are the key players in the birth of the modern research of the unity of the TP, which was preceded by Wolfe and Budde at the beginning of the 20th century. See, also from a New Testament perspective, Watson’s extensive treatment of the TP from the standpoint of the reception of this corpus by peshet Habakkuk in Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 78–162. From his study of peshet Habakkuk and its place among other Minor prophet texts from the discoveries in the Judean Desert, Watson casts doubt upon the belief that the TP were ever read or utilized as twelve individual books in a written form.

7 Cf. e.g., House, *The Unity of the Twelve*; James Nogalski, “The Day(s) of YHWH in the Book of the Twelve,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, no. 38 (1999): 617–42; Rolf Rendtorff, “Alas for the Day: The ‘Day of the Lord’ in the Book of the Twelve,” in *God in the Fray* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 186–97; John Barton, “The Day of Yahweh in the Minor Prophets,” in *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart*, ed. Carmel McCarthy and John F. Healey, JSOT (London: T&T Clark, 2004). And many important essays in James Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney, eds., *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (Atlanta: SBL, 2000) and Paul Lewis Redditt and Aaron Schar, eds., *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003).

the three variant orderings of this corpus).⁸ The latter, in part, is stoked by texts found in Cave 4 at Qumran.⁹

The revival noted above in the OT biblical studies community has also been felt by the NT community. Some have begun to realize the impact of the TP on the NT when the TP corpus is considered to be one book. When taken together, the TP are among the most quoted books in the NT, standing in fourth position with 25 explicit citations, behind the Pentateuch (116), the Psalms (66), and Isaiah (63).¹⁰

Two studies, in particular, have asked how the NT as a corpus might have perceived and received the TP. Both studies pose similar questions regarding the use of the TP in the NT. We will see below, each of these two studies take on noticeably different assumptions and conclusions. In order to shed greater light on the current trends of study on the TP in the NT we will look at these two works, beginning with the latest study. Our analysis of these works will also serve to demonstrate the need for a more focused study on this topic.

1.a.1 Michael Shepherd's *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*

Michael Shepherd's study *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament* explores the proper context for understanding the quotation of the OT in the NT.¹¹ Shepherd's basic belief is that when the NT authors quoted the TP, they had the entire corpus of the TP in mind in sequential order, rather than just the particular TP books quoted. Shepherd's concern is, therefore, to read the TP as one unified book, according to its "final [redacted] form."¹² Shepherd suggests that since the NT authors would have read the TP as a unit, they would have expected that a broader theological context would naturally have informed

8 Cf. e.g., Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*; Nogalski, *Literary Precursors*; James Nogalski, "Intertextuality and the Twelve," in *Forming Prophetic Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 102–24; Rolland E. Wolfe, "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," *ZAW* 53 (1935): 90–129; Karl Budde, "Eine Folgenschwere Redaktion Des Zwölfprophetenbuchs," *ZAW* 39 (1922): 218–29; Schneider, "Unity".

9 Cf. esp., Jones, *Formation*; Jones, "The Book of the Twelve as a Witness to Ancient Biblical Interpretation"; Aaron Schar, *Die Entstehung Des Zwölfprophetenbuchs: Neubearbeitungen von Amos Im Rahmen Schriftenübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998); Watson, *Paul*, 78–163.

10 These statistics are according to Helmut Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones: The Minor Prophets in the New Testament," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 280.

11 Cf. Michael B. Shepherd, *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 1.

12 Cf. Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 1, 2.

any specific quotation.¹³ It is, therefore, Shepherd's assumption that the proper context in which one finds the meaning of a given TP quotation in the NT is its context within the TP scroll. This raises some important methodological questions, many that tend fundamentally to hamper Shepherd's overall contribution.

In an important critical review of this book, Steve Moyise correctly points out that Shepherd's study regrettably suffers from many deficiencies stemming from his assumptions. These include lack of a cogent method,¹⁴ a consistent inattention to important exegetical issues,¹⁵ and "simplistic" explanations of long-standing debates, some of which are outlined below or which will appear at relevant junctures in the body of the present study.¹⁶

Other concerns arise in addition to those of Moyise that undermine the clarity this study gives to the investigation of the TP in the NT. First, Shepherd never establishes the source text of the TP convincingly. His study is not a textual one and never claims to be. It is undoubtedly a literary study in the tradition of canonical criticism, but the question of which TP text he believes is the source for the NT corpus is never actually asked nor answered. The MT is simply assumed to be the base text.

However, if *all* of the NT authors were reading the TP in unity according to one supposed "final form" as Shepherd suggests, one should ask which one they were reading. Can we be certain, however, that they were all reading the same one (a question addressed by Utzschneider below)? This is a particularly important question for Shepherd's underlying assumption about context since there are three orders in which the TP has come down to us (i.e., a version nearer to the MT, a version of "the LXX" [i.e., OG-LXX, A-group LXX, proto-Theodotonic, etc.], and one nearer to that of the Qumran texts from Nahal Hever). Shepherd demonstrates awareness of these differing orders in his introduction and his fourth chapter, but his awareness does not translate into his

13 Cf. Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 2.

14 Moyise, in fact, says at one point, "I hesitate to call [Shepherd's approach] a method." Moyise's criticism is understandable since Shepherd's "method" rests heavily on consistent assertion.

15 In fact, on this point, Moyise's opinion is not veiled. He says,

"What I cannot understand is why Shepherd feels the need to give one-line answers to such complex textual phenomena ... Was Shepherd under some publishing constraint to discuss all thirty quotations from the Minor Prophets in such a short space?"

16 Steve Moyise, "Review of the Twelve Prophets in the New Testament," *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*, Michael B. Shepherd, *RBL* 5 (2011). The other major review on Shepherd is more of a summary, but alludes to similar concerns to those of Moyise. Cf. Brad E. Kelle, "Review of the Twelve Prophets in the New Testament," *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*, Michael B. Shepherd, *RSR* 39, no. 4 (2013): 261–62.

method of understanding how these differing orders may have influenced later reception by various authors.¹⁷

Instead, Shepherd's argument rests heavily upon the continual assertion that it was the MT-TP that was the textual base for the entire NT corpus. He concludes his fourth chapter, "[The] quotations of [the NT authors] presuppose the order of the books as they appear in the Masoretic Text (e.g., Acts 15:17)."¹⁸ This is a problematic stance, especially in reference to the Lukan use of the TP and to the fact that many NT writers quote from a Greek text (using language that, in many cases, agrees with Greek scriptural MSS), which of course differs in order from the MT.

Further, Shepherd disregards the Septuagint as a relevant text source because it is a "secondary arrangement."¹⁹ Of course, this is a debate that still exists in Shepherd's OT circles, but this does not seem to be at all relevant to answering the question that Shepherd sets out to answer, which concerns the NT use of the TP. More can be said on this, but there is sufficient reason to cast doubt on the efficacy of Shepherd's methods and the accuracy of the conclusions borne out by his study.

In many ways, our first concern raised leads to the second. At the heart of Shepherd's thesis is that of reception and authorial intent. However, he continually and incorrectly assumes the NT corpus is a monolithic entity. As already asked, can we be at all sure that each NT author was quoting from the same TP text? Again, it is his assumption that the MT is the source text for all of the NT writers quoting the TP. This assumption obfuscates any clarity the evidence might give about the reception of the TP in the NT. The NT is too diverse a corpus to make such an assumption, and such an assumption fundamentally skews the evidence.

¹⁷ Cf. Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 2–3. In chapter four of his study he has a fuller treatment of the alternative ordering of the TP, but it reads more as a defense of the MT ordering, and reaffirms his belief that "the Septuagint" is secondary, even to the point of suggesting that the redactor of the LXX ordering of the Twelve Prophets arranged the books according to a pragmatic method rather than with theological astuteness (Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 76). Oddly enough, he manages to discuss the redaction of the MT-Twelve without reference to any of Nogalski's work. But, again, the discussion of text-priority actually has no bearing on the task at hand, namely how the NT authors quoted or perceived the TP. Should he not be asking what was the text base preferred by the NT authors (or more accurately, the source text for *each* author)?

¹⁸ Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 76.

¹⁹ Cf. Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 2, 3, 75. One example (though examples abound) for where the privileged place of the Hebrew over the LXX-Twelve flies in the face of the established fact that the LXX-Twelve is clearly the text source is in his treatment of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13:41 (*The Twelve*, 47–48).

Nevertheless, Shepherd decides to study the quotations of the TP in the NT through the lens of the MT-TP book order, beginning with Hosea and moving through the order of the MT-TP to Malachi. Shepherd arranges the quotations of the Twelve Prophets in the NT according to how they fit that order.²⁰

This structure is problematic on many levels. The biggest problem with this method is that it gives precedence to the context and agenda of the MT-TP. What about the context set by the specific book or epistle of the NT wherein the quotation is found? Additionally, what if the given NT writer is found not to be quoting from the MT? But in the end, according to Shepherd, the context *is* the setting of the MT-TP for *every* NT author even if they are quoting from the LXX-TP (again, as a majority of the NT authors do). This means that the context of the quotation in the given NT writing, the order in which the quotation is placed in reference to other quotations in that writing, and the purposes and agendas of the NT writer in quoting the texts, all take a 'methodological backseat'.²¹ This is seen, for example, in his treatment of Joel 3:5 in a section that lumps the Lukan use in Acts 2:17–21 with the Pauline use in Romans 10:13.²²

Shepherd's structure is potentially a creative heuristic for exploring the TP in the NT. It is an understandable method since he proposes that the principal context for understanding the TP in the NT is in the unified MT-TP. However, it is a structure that is impractical and has too many methodological liabilities for the purposes that Shepherd is attempting to accomplish. This means that, in the end, it leaves the reader with less clarity on the place of the TP *in the setting of the NT corpus* (but maybe the other way around).²³

20 For example, chapter one covers Hos. 2:1, 25 in Rom. 9:25–26; Hos. 6:6 in Matt. 9:13; 12:7; Hos. 10:8 in Lk. 23:20; Hos. 11:1 in Matt. 2:15; Hos. 13:14 in 1 Cor. 15:55, with respective discussions of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 [where is Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:16?] and Jonah 2:1 in Matt. 12:40 placed just after the first Hosea quotation under consideration). The reasoning for the placement of these non-Hosea quotations here is opaque, since ch. 1 is alone slated to be on Hosea, and ch. 2 is said to include discussions on Amos and Jonah quotations.

21 Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 2.

22 Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 31–38. In fact, in his introduction, he says "It is not necessary to presuppose that the New Testament authors were consistent with their sources, but neither is it necessary to assume they were not" (*The Twelve*, 2). What does that actually mean? This could be a misleading statement since it sounds like it is a nuanced approach to the NT authors, but it actually treats the NT writers as a homogeneous entity that can be treated with a single approach and possibly even a single conclusion. And, again, in light of the way he lays out his method, what is meant by this statement will never be known since his study unduly privileges the MT-TP context, its order and its agenda, and is not the agenda one might assume of the NT writers.

23 In this vein, what may have helped Shepherd would have been a conclusion at the end of his monograph to clarify and summarize how his method has revealed new insight in the

Finally, Shepherd's study fails to enter into a dialogue with some of the most relevant secondary material.²⁴ In fact, Shepherd never interacts with the second study we will examine by Helmut Utzschneider called "Flourishing Bones—The Minor Prophets in the New Testament." Similar questions of reception to those posed by Shepherd are those Utzschneider attempts to address. Utzschneider's study is a starting point for the study of the TP in the NT, primarily as a textual study.

1.a.2 Helmut Utzschneider's "Flourishing Bones—The Minor Prophets in the New Testament"

In a study published five years before Shepherd's, Utzschneider asks how the bones of the Twelve Prophets flourished in the NT. He attempts to answer this question by asking further how the New Testament writers perceive the TP. Did the NT authors read the TP as a unity? Moreover, what Septuagint text did the NT writers use for the TP?²⁵

Utzschneider suggests that the text-evidence for the TP, especially the evidence found in the scrolls at Qumran, demonstrates that the TP *as a scroll* was meant for the common use of a community of readers.²⁶ At a certain level, this is harmonious with Shepherd. However, in a significant way against Shepherd, Utzschneider says that this same evidence, paired with the multiple orders in which the TP have come down to us, casts doubt on the belief that the TP was ever read "as *one* or as a *uniform* book";²⁷ Shepherd never addresses this objection, probably due to many of his assumptions. The only place where Utzschneider is hesitant to make a solid pronouncement in this vein is in reference to Acts. Overall he concludes, "The flourishing of the Twelve ...

TP in the NT. Instead, the student of his work is left with loose ends; evidence without a synthesis or a way forward.

24 In reference to the texts cited, and of specific concern to the present study, Shepherd never cites Holtz's (Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen Über die Alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968]) foundational study on the text of scriptural citations in Luke, which would have challenged his assumptions at many points. Additionally, as noted already, he never cites any of Nogalski's studies on the redaction of the Twelve.

25 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 273.

26 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 273–74. Watson also spends considerable space making the same case in his monograph on Pauline intertextuality with specific recourse to peshet Habakkuk. In chapters 2 ("Reading the Twelve") and 3 ("The God of My Salvation"), accounting for nearly 100 pages of the work, Watson demonstrates that the Jewish milieu only knew of a collected corpus of the Twelve Prophets. See Watson, *Paul*, 78–163.

27 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 274, cf. also 291. Emphasis original.

presumably is not to be understood as the success of *one* best-seller volume but as a much more complex process of perception, transmission, and reception.”²⁸

Utzschneider’s nuanced way of looking at the corpus of the TP leads us to the second way in which these two studies depart. Utzschneider bases his investigation of which text the NT authors used to quote the on the assumption that they were using a version of “the LXX.” The question that guides his study right away differentiates it from Shepherd’s study. He asks, “Which *Septuagint* did New Testament writers and readers use when they cited and read the Minor Prophets in Greek?”²⁹ Obviously, this is quite a different starting place from that of Shepherd. However, it is backed by strong textual evidence and a strong scholarly consensus.

For Utzschneider, the source of the NT quotations of the TP goes back to four “LXX” sources (not one single Hebrew source). First, there is a category of quotations that Utzschneider calls “short citations” of the TP.³⁰ Utzschneider believes these are drawn from memory in the form of familiar aphorisms or common sayings. For Utzschneider, though a text *Vorlage* is difficult to locate for these sayings, there are still features that lead one to plausible Greek versions.³¹ Second, according to Utzschneider, of the twenty-three citations, he covers in his study fourteen, go back to the OG-LXX according to “the word material,”³² but not according to word sequence.³³ Third, he observes the evidence of the *Erfüllungszitate*, or fulfillment citations, in Matthew. For Utzschneider, these citations draw from an LXX version closest to a proto-Theodotonic text.³⁴ These are short citations that Utzschneider says can “diverge considerably from the vocabulary of the entire Septuagint tradition *and*, in these divergences, contain elements from the vocabulary of the *Hebrew consonantal text*,”³⁵ due to early Jewish revisions of the OG (also called, Proto-Theodotonic).³⁶ Finally, there is a category made up exclusively of the long citations in Acts. According to Utzschneider, these texts contain variants

28 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 274. Emphasis original.

29 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 273. Emphasis mine.

30 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 282–85.

31 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 285.

32 Cf. the chart in Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 276–78.

33 By “word material,” it would seem take Utzschneider to mean a verbal comparison.

34 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 288–91. A subtle but important nuance to Utzschneider, is Tov who suggests that: “the proto-Theodotion is none other than *kaige*-Theodotion tentatively ascribed to the middle of the first century BCE.” (Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 145). We will Utzschneider’s language going forward as we interact with his study granting the accuracy of Tov.

35 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 288. Emphasis original.

36 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 291.

derived from the Alexandrian group of manuscripts and can be more accurately placed in the tradition of this “LXX” version (this version, in reference to Acts, will be discussed further below).³⁷

Utzschneider concludes his study with one of his original governing questions: “Which LXX did the New Testament readers and writers use when they read and cited the Minor Prophets?” He answers that this question must be “answered in a subtly differentiated manner.”³⁸ Unlike Shepherd, Utzschneider sees that the way the NT quotes the TP offers up a host of possibilities for biblical scholars to explore further. In other words, not just one single conclusion can be offered that answers the question of the reception of the TP in the NT according to the method of Utzschneider. The corpus of the NT is too multifarious in its sources, authorial intentions, purposes, contexts, genre, etc. to give an answer that does not have a degree of nuance. Biblical scholars must give more detailed attention to each NT writer and how they read the scroll of the TP in its various extant versions.

Rather than serving to answer the question of reception of the TP in a corpus as diverse as the NT, such broad studies as Shepherd and Utzschneider stand as invitations to further and more careful exploration. They are catalysts for closer analyses of the quotations by a carefully nuanced study of each specific case according to the use of each NT author and book. Such a study is what is embarked upon here concerning the LXX-TP in Acts. These two studies lead us, intentionally or otherwise, to view the flourishing of the bones of the TP through the lens of the one receiving that corpus, investigated according to how that author would like these bones to be appropriated for specific contextual purposes.³⁹ It is as Ruiz once said, referring to his study on Ezekiel: “I seek to enter into a dialogue with the text and with the text within the text.”⁴⁰

37 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 287–88.

38 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 292.

39 One study that has engaged in a study of each of the writings in the NT is the edited book by Steve Moyise and M. Menken (*Minor Prophets in the New Testament* [London: T&T Clark, 2009]), which also includes a study on the TP in the “Second Temple” context. This study contains important contributions, but cannot be adequately addressed in this present study, nor would it be helpful to do so. This volume is simply groundbreaking by its method of looking at the TP as one corpus and asking how it is being appropriated by respective writings in the NT corpus. Of course, this study will take a closer look at van de Sandt’s contribution on Acts, and further to the studies he has published that are devoted to each respective quotation in Acts (since he is the only one to publish on all the TP quotations in Acts, and to do so with a cogent method).

40 J. P. Ruiz, *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation 16:17–19:10* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989), 520.

1.b *The Twelve Prophets in Acts: a Case for Closer Analysis*

Utzschneider's case for a more nuanced study of the reception of the TP in the NT suggests that a more detailed study must be undertaken on individual NT books. In particular, his study sheds light on some important textual evidence about the quotation of the TP in Acts. This data begins to make a compelling case for the importance of a study on the TP in Acts even more so than in the other books of the NT corpus that quote the TP. (I will not, however, be primarily arguing that case in this study).

First, the volume of quoted material of the TP in Acts is significant. In the past, each quotation of the LXX-Twelve-Prophets in Acts has received significant scholarly attention individually, primarily because each is located in areas of specific importance to the Lukan narrative, Lukan theology, and in some cases, the overall theology of the NT. Sometimes these quotations have been considered together as in the case of the two quotations of Amos.⁴¹ But, when considered as one scroll, the total number of quotations and the word-count gives the TP in Acts even greater weight.

Again, if we consider the TP as one corpus in Acts, their presence would carry more weight than if we consider them as individual intertexts in Acts. The four TP quotations in Acts place the TP among the Psalms (8×) and Isaiah (6×) as the most often quoted book by Luke in Acts.⁴²

However, what is maybe more impressive is the textual evidence and the Greek word-count behind the TP quotations in Acts. First, according to the study done by Utzschneider, there are only four citations of the TP in the NT that consist of twenty words or more, and they are all found in Acts.⁴³ According to word count, there is more quoted material from the TP than any other OT

41 Cf. e.g., Richard, "Creative Use"; W. Edward Glenny, "The Relationship of the Two Amos Quotations in Acts," ETS National Conference (Milwaukee, 2012) I have also given these quotations attention in a presentation Aaron W. White, "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts' Reexamined: The Lukan Appropriation of LXX-Amos in Acts and What It Tells Us About Luke," ETS National Conference (Atlanta, 2015), and a later published version of this presentation: Aaron W. White, "Revisiting the 'Creative' Use of Amos in Acts and What It Tells Us About Luke," *BTB* 46, no. 2 (2016): 79–90.

42 The Pentateuch is not counted here since the vast majority of these quotations from this corpus are contained in the Lukan Stephen's speech in Acts 7 as allusions to known stories in Israel's past. Besides these allusions, four other quotations or allusions of the Pentateuch are left in Acts. Two that reference the "prophet like me" prophecy from Deut. 18:15–19 (Acts 3:22–23; 7:37), a conflated allusion to the Abrahamic Covenant in Gen. 22:18; 26:4; 28:14 in Acts 3:25, and a rather perfunctory appeal to the law in Ex. 22:28 by the Lukan Paul in Acts 23:5 (on this quotation, see Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New*, 57).

43 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 279.

book in Acts. There are approximately 182 words total for the TP. The Psalms are second with approximately 120 words, and Isaiah is third with approximately 95 words. Similar to other medium-to-large-length quotations of the TP in the NT, the TP quotations in Acts have undergone minimal modification.⁴⁴ According to the study by Utzschneider, these longer quotations can be traced to a written *Vorlage* and appear to have resisted some of the tendencies found in aphoristic quotations of sources. Luke's *Vorlage* for the TP is covered below.⁴⁵

Secondly, Acts is unique in the way it introduces the TP quotations.⁴⁶ The way Acts introduces its quotations of the TP is unlike other NT authors that quote the TP. In fact, Utzschneider suggests that the introduction formulas for the TP found in Acts may imply a single scroll, much like that which Ben Sira was alluding.⁴⁷

In Acts, unlike other places in the NT, the TP referenced as a book or a collection of writings. Acts 7:42 refers to a “book of the prophets” when it introduces the quotation of Amos 5:25–27 (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν). Additionally, Acts 15:16 introduces the Amos 9:11–12 quotation by calling them “the words of the prophets” (καὶ τοῦτω συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν καθὼς γέγραπται). Similarly, there appears to be a known collection of sayings from the prophets, as it might be alluded to in the Acts 2 quotation of Joel 3:1–15, and the Acts 13 quotation of Hab. 1:5. In each of these occurrences, like the written collections, there are utterances (εἶπον; Acts 2:16) or sayings from “the prophets” (τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις; Acts 13:40) alluded to, much like those observed above by Utzschneider in Acts 7 and 15.

Out of the four TP quotations in Acts, the Joel quotation is the only one that names a prophet. Each of the other three do not. According to strong MS tradition, the Lukan Peter says in Acts 2:16 that his quotation is from “the prophet Joel.” However, some may follow MS D that leaves Ἰωήλ out, and simply refers to “the prophet” [singular].⁴⁸ Ropes calls Ἰωήλ a later scribal addition.⁴⁹

44 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 279.

45 Cf. Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 285.

46 For a thorough analysis of Lukan introductory formulas to Scripture as well as a comparison to introductory formulas to scriptural texts in some contemporary Jewish religious writings at Qumran, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 296–301.

47 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 281; Josep Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, eds., *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition, Vol. 1—Acts 1.1–5.52: Jerusalem* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 169.

48 James H. Ropes, *The Text of Acts, The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Macmillan, 1926), 15–16.

49 Ropes, *Text*, 16; Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts*: 1, 169.

As we have already seen in reference to Acts 7:42, Utzschneider points out that Luke in his gospel and in Acts is unique among NT writers in using the terms βιβλίον or βιβλος in reference to identifiable scriptural books, or a single scroll (cf. Lk. 20:42; Acts 1:20; 7:42). Likely this is the case for the quotation of the TP in Acts 7:42 and by plausible implication for the other three TP quotations found in Acts. This could mean that Luke viewed the TP in the same way as he would have viewed the book of the Psalms or Isaiah, as singular respective works. It is also important to note that the quotation of the TP is never associated with a named prophet from the corpus (if one takes Ropes' suggestion for Joel as fact), which may indicate a reading that looks to a whole rather than its parts. In the end, Utzschneider, against his conclusions, says that Acts is the one "significant exception" among other NT books by quoting the TP as if it were one book or scroll.⁵⁰

Third,⁵¹ there is a locatable text source for the TP that is unique to Acts in the NT corpus. Specifically, the LXX-TP text source is traceable to one MS group, namely, a text closest to a proto-Alexandrian Greek Old Testament text

50 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 281.

51 A procedural note: Often in NT intertextual studies the Greek Jewish Scriptures is simply referred to as the singular "the LXX," or "the Septuagint." Technically speaking, this is an incorrect and misleading way to speak of these texts that Luke appeals to, primarily since "the LXX" proper is the Greek Pentateuch (cf. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "In a Mirror, Dimly—Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden [Atlanta: SBL, 2006], 15). The term "LXX" can tend to insinuate a singular corpus or single translation, which it is not, as the introductions in NETS (2007), the Septuagint introduction edited by James Aitken in *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (New York: T&T Clark, 2015), and other studies have now demonstrated with clarity, showing that the books following the Pentateuch were translated by various translators, some books including evidence of multiple translators, and each book being translated with often differing translation techniques, agendas, understandings of the Hebrew text-*Vorlage*, and historical and geographical contexts. This study will respect the complexity of these issues by distinguishing each book of the TP, or the TP as a whole (since, though it has been debated, it seems likely that the TP were translated by one translator, cf. e.g., Jennifer M. Dines, "The Minor Prophets," in *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. James K. Aitken [New York: T&T Clark, 2015], 438–44; W. Edward Glenny, *Amos: A Commentary Based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus* [Leiden: Brill, 2013], 20–23), which is used by Luke in a form that would best be described as a "proto-Alexandrian-type Greek Old Testament" text. Following this introductory chapter, for convenience, reference to this corpus or portions therein will look like: "LXX-Joel," "LXX-Amos," "LXX-Hab.," or "LXX-TP" (or, "LXX-Twelve/Twelve Prophets/Book-of-the-Twelve" etc.). When the larger Greek Scriptures are appealed to, they will be called something like "the Greek Scriptures," "the Greek Jewish Scriptures," or "the Greek Old Testament."

group.⁵² Some signs of Theodotion may be detected in Luke-Acts.⁵³ Acts is the only book that quotes the TP from this MS tradition in the NT, according to Utzschneider.

Certain variants only found in the A-group correctly lead Utzschneider to this conclusion. (1) In Acts 2:18, the Greek phrases καί γε, ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου, and τὰς δούλας μου collectively point to the use of the A-group MSS. (2) In 7:43 after τοὺς τύπους, the pronoun αὐτῶν is omitted, corresponding with the A-group. (3) In 13:41, it is only in the A-group that the pronoun ὑμῖν is found with the preceding phrase τις ἐκδιηγῆται. The same is true for the particle ἄν that precedes the phrase ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον, and the noun τὸν κύριον that finishes that phrase in 15:16. Collectively, these variants rightly lead Utzschneider and others back to one specific text that Luke was reading as his source for the TP in Acts.⁵⁴ Additionally, the clarity that we can have about the source text for the TP quotations in Acts uniquely allows us to determine what a Lukan change is and investigate that change for what it says about the Lukan appropriation of the respective text of the TP.⁵⁵

Finally, the placement of these quotations at important redemptive-historical turning points in the first 15 chapters in Acts is a compelling reason to take a closer look. Joel 3:1–5 is located in Acts 2 in the Pentecost context. Amos 5:25–27 is located at the end of the Jerusalem mission and immediately before the introduction of Paul. Habakkuk 1:5 is in the context of the mission to the diaspora and is immediately followed by the first Gentiles qua Gentiles expressing faith in Jesus without prior synagogue association. And finally, Amos 9:11–12 stands as the text used to authenticate the place of Gentiles qua Gentiles in the people of God, warrants the church's endorsement of the

52 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 288. Cf. also, Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 27; Marshall, "Acts," 516; Hubertus van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," in *Minor Prophets in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 57–58. Also note Bovon's studies on the LXX that interacts with some of Holtz's proposals (*Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)* [Waco: Baylor, 2006], 110–17). It should also be noted that each of these TP quotations, as per the Lukan convention for citing Scripture explicitly, is introduced by an introduction "formula," sharing some close affinities with Qumranic quotations of Scripture (Cf. Marshall, "Acts," 522). For more on citation formulas in Luke's Gospel and Acts see Marshall, "Acts," 522, and more broadly in the NT, see Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 274–76.

53 For more on Luke and possible signs of Theodotion in the Lukan *Vorlage* see Aaron White, "More Than a Counselor The Longer Reading Isaiah 9:5b in Codex Alexandrinus and Its Hexaplaric Origins," *Adamantius* (forthcoming, 2020).

54 Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 288; van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 63.

55 Cf. van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 63.

Gentile mission, and is the point where the quotation of Scripture ceases in Acts until Paul's quotation of Isaiah 6:9–10 in Acts 28:26–27 (this is discussed further in the chapter on Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–18).⁵⁶ The pivotal moment at which these quotations are found, and the fact that they take up such a large space in the first half of Acts leads one to further inquire into the Lukan reception of the TP.⁵⁷

At two points in his study, Utzschneider makes two broad statements about the TP in the NT. First, he says, “By and large the findings suggest that the book of the Twelve was not really of great literary and theological relevance for the New Testament authors ...”⁵⁸ Second, Utzschneider says, “... the New Testament does not consider them as a well-defined, literary, or theological entity.”⁵⁹ According to the evidence and reasons are briefly given above, however, it is plausible that Acts may be an exception to the conclusions made

56 Cf. also Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel*, 307–8. Here, Fitzmyer observes a similar point to me, but is concerned with citations of Scripture in so-called “evangelistic activity” in Acts. He therefore sees Scripture citation, in essence, ceasing at Acts 13. Not a lot needs to be said on this other than to note that if we broaden our scope to “redemptive-historical” activity, the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15 concerning the admission of the Gentiles, and the quotation of Is. 6:9–10 to round out the narrative of Acts (28:26–27) are then included, with only Paul's more perfunctory appeal to the law (Ex. 22:27) in Acts 23 standing on the outside looking in. The focus on the evangelistic story line, though being a substantial aspect of the Acts narrative is probably too narrow and missed the larger Lukan priority; that being, the redemptive-historical story-line.

57 This will gain more attention below, but we note a caveat: our assumption is that Luke read a book called “The Book of the Twelve,” and that he read it in a particular theological agenda, or construal, for his composition of Acts. However, the argument made here is not Luke's use of the LXX-TP evidences any specific extant ordering of the TP (MT, LXX, Qumran, or otherwise) nor does this argument point to any specific conclusions about text or source criticism based upon the Lukan appropriation (though these methods will be appealed to in order to solidify some of the literary points made later).

What this means is that Luke did not possess and read Scriptures in the same form that we possess today in the 21st century that divides the Twelve Prophets into “the Minor Prophets” that are divided by titles and page breaks. Above, evidence is already presented that would suggest that Luke is reading a Greek scriptural text closest to the A-group. This would not imply beyond a shadow of a doubt that he was reading it in the order that the A-group witnesses, nor does it imply that any specific order mattered to Luke, though it may have. Those are questions for other studies, since that reaches beyond the scope of the present study. The point in noting these assumptions is that Luke appealed to the Twelve Prophets as a book as he would have Isaiah or the Psalms, and the overall argument for Luke reading the LXX-TP in Acts according to a unique theological construal should not be confused with an argument for the specific order of the TP in the assumed Lukan text base.

58 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 282.

59 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 291.

by Utzschneider. In sum, the evidence endorses a closer study of this corpus in Acts.⁶⁰

II Previous Work on the TP in Acts and Models of Interpretation

As noted above, the number of studies on the TP in Acts is vast when each quotation is taken individually. The role of this literature review is not to cover each exhaustively. In fact, the number of these studies is too massive to be mentioned individually in this place, let alone discussed (though many of them will appear throughout the remainder of this study as they become relevant).⁶¹

Jacob Jervell has correctly said that Luke's subject in his writings is redemptive history and that behind this subject is the matrix of Scriptures through which the experiences of Luke and his contemporaries (their shared context of the "last days") are understood.⁶² Jervell thus suggests that Luke is using

60 Considering that the majority position is that Luke's gospel and Acts make up a two-volume work, one might ask why this study does not look at the Twelve Prophets in Luke. In light of the evidence for the need for this as laid out above, that the use of the TP in Acts distinguishes itself from the way in which the rest of the NT corpus uses it, even from Luke's first volume, the TP quotations in The Gospel of Luke will not be covered in this work. Luke seems to perceive and utilize the TP in a unique way in Acts (cf. also, Marshall, "Acts," 527). van de Sandt has suggested that the reception of these texts into Luke's gospel is simply mimicking those in the other synoptics. Cf. van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 60. van de Sandt's proposal does not seem to be a credible reason for not studying Luke's gospel. Adding to the problems of this assertion has been the significant critique of Q (Mark S. Goodacre and Perrin, Nicholas, eds., *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique* (London: SPCK, 2004); Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002), which undermines van de Sandt's thought, and may by implication endorse a study of Luke's gospel, in particular, or in "conversation" (not comparison) with the other synoptics.

61 The amount of work done on each of these quotations is significant because at least it begins to prove, albeit implicitly, the need for continued study of this corpus in Acts, both because of the place in the narrative in which it is situated, and the often unclear ways Luke chooses to quote these texts in comparison to other scriptural texts in Acts. And it seems to lead, again, to the nagging question of why there has yet to appear a devoted study on the corpus of the LXX-TP in Acts, alone. Of course, other studies, such as commentaries and certain surveys, have covered all of the TP in Acts simply by virtue of the scope of the work. A couple of exceptional examples might be Marshall's treatment of the scriptural quotations in Acts ("Acts.") and Moyise's work on the "later" New Testament (*The Later New Testament Writings and Scripture: The Old Testament in Acts, Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles and Revelation* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012]).

62 Jacob Jervell, "The Future of the Past: Luke's Vision of Salvation History and Its Bearing on His Writing of History," in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 109–10.

Scripture to write his history of the church, but further, he is appropriating Scripture to a new context in order to demonstrate progress and fulfillment.⁶³

The importance of observing this fact is that it calls into play important issues of method and interpretation. The most pressing question is how Luke uses scriptural texts. What is his method and where does that appealed-to-text gain its meaning? In its original context? In its new context? In Luke's own imaginative agency as an author of a text? Do other mediating sources, such as other interpretive methods outside the quoting author, have authority over the meaning of the text as it appears in the final text in which it is quoted? For example, since Amos 5:25–27 is quoted in both CD-A 7 and Acts 7:49–50, does the quotation and method of interpretation of Amos 5:25–27 in CD-A 7 form part of the context and therefore influence the meaning of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7? And if not, how should the normative text and the receptor texts all relate? These questions are specifically crucial to the present work since it appears likely that a particular construal of the LXX-TP texts to be at the center of Luke's redemptive-historical narrative that is rapidly progressing and therefore producing fresher and fresher contexts in which to situate these scriptural quotations.

For our review of previous studies, we will first note a couple of important items. First, since this study is attempting something that has not been attempted before in a single work (i.e., a study devoted to the Lukan appropriation of the LXX-TP in Acts), a literature review is naturally difficult. However, representative studies have been chosen that deal with one or more of these quotations with differing methods of interpretation. Secondly, while this study is at one level studying the use of the Old Testament in the New and seeks to make a contribution to that field, this section is expressly *not* a literature review on that topic. Such a review is too far-ranging for the purposes of the present study. Specifically, this is a review of methods of understanding the role of the LXX-TP in Acts and their particular appropriation into a new context. That being said, two broad methodological categories will be our focus. The first category is referred to as “the exegetes” and the second “the conversationalists,” for reasons explained below.

11.a “The Exegetes”

In this first category are those whom one might suggest are “exegetes.” Exegesis is best understood as a method by which interpreters of intertextuality seek to account for everything in the text, giving an explanation at the most detailed level for the verbal and grammatical meaning of the text. It follows in many ways that this is also a method from a broadly grammatical-historical

63 Cf. Jervell, “Future,” 107.

methodological frame of reference, much in the vein of the early hermeneutics of E. D. Hirsch, former chair of English at University of Virginia, that concerns itself in a significant way with an “original meaning” in the text that is closely associated with a supposed authorial intention.⁶⁴ For the scholars in this category, the Lukan appropriation of a text is best explained as Luke looking to the scriptural text with an exegetical method that does not leave any stones unturned. It will become clear that there should be pause concerning this category because it too tightly binds the volition of the author, and in particular, him as a reader of Scripture.

In this category, we will review Hubertus (Huub) van de Sandt’s contribution to the understanding of the TP in Acts according to a classic grammatical-historical hermeneutic and then Richard Bauckham’s appeal to early Jewish hermeneutics to illuminate the Lukan use of Amos 9:11–12.

11.a.1 Huub van de Sandt and the Minor Prophets in Acts

Huub van de Sandt is the only author who has endeavored to study each of the Twelve Prophets quotations in Acts with a cogent method and who holds to this method of reading these quotations. Methodologically, his approach shares much with Shepherd’s study covered earlier (though, certainly, the similarities in method should not also imply that van de Sandt should receive the same criticism Shepherd received above since van de Sandt’s work is overall much more exegetically careful than that of Shepherd). For such an approach, the “original context,” where the quotation is originally located in the Jewish Scriptures, is the place wherein the meaning of the appropriated text is found. Sometimes this is called the “original meaning” of the quoted text. This means that at the heart of this exegetical method is the belief that the Lukan use of Scripture is understood best by the context from where the quotation is drawn and its verbal and grammatical alteration can also be accounted for through a thorough study of that context.

The contribution van de Sandt’s makes to this “fascinating”⁶⁵ area of Lukan scholarship has come in the form of four individual essay-length studies of each

64 The primary statement of E. D. Hirsch, especially of his earlier hermeneutical methodology, is found in *Validity in Interpretation* (Chelsea: Yale University Press, 1967).

65 In a personal correspondence (Hubertus van de Sandt, email correspondence [2015]), Prof. van de Sandt revealed his passion for this area of study into which he invested a great deal of his career, calling them the “fascinating quotations of the Minor Prophets in Acts”; indicating that, as an authority on this corpus in Acts van de Sandt too also concluded that Acts has a distinct voice on the TP in the unique way of it receives this corpus, as suggested above.

of the TP in Acts⁶⁶ and one essay in a volume edited by Moyise and Menken that summarizes his take on the TP in Luke-Acts.⁶⁷ The method adopted by van de Sandt's for investigating these quotations is very complex and generally source-critical and grammatical-historical.⁶⁸ The complete work of van de Sandt's cannot be given their due attention in this section but will gain more considerable attention in the following chapters as they become relevant. It is important to note that beyond van de Sandt's devoted study, no other has contributed at such length to this distinguished corpus in Acts.

Since van de Sandt's method is marked by the belief that the original contexts influenced Luke thematically and verbally in a major way,⁶⁹ his five studies of the Minor Prophets in Acts rest heavily upon verbal and thematic links to other areas of the Jewish Scriptures, either in the Pentateuch (Deuteronomy, specifically) for both of the Amos quotations or in the broader context of the book where the quotation is drawn, as in the case of Joel 3 and Hab. 1. Two of his studies are highlighted below to clarify his method, both on Amos in Acts.⁷⁰

van de Sandt's investigation of Amos in Acts appeals almost exclusively to a context outside of Acts for the meaning of the Amos quotations. Correctly, van de Sandt believes that both of the Amos quotations in Acts have a certain correspondence in the narrative of Acts⁷¹ (as Richard⁷² first observed, and I have also argued for elsewhere⁷³), but what this correspondence can tell us about their respective and collective meaning in Acts and what it tells us about the Lukan appropriation of these texts for van de Sandt, is left to the reader to guess. Instead, van de Sandt shifts focus to Deuteronomy.

66 Hubertus van de Sandt, "The Fate of the Gentiles in Joel and Acts 2: An Intertextual Study," *ETL* 66, no. 1 (1990): 56–77; Hubertus van de Sandt, "Why is Amos 5,25–27 Quoted in Acts 7,42f?," *ZNW* 82, no. 1–2 (1991): 67–87; Hubertus van de Sandt, "The Quotations in Acts 13:32–52 as a Reflection of Luke's LXX Interpretation," *Bib* 75, no. 1 (1994): 26–58; Hubertus van de Sandt, "An Explanation of Acts 15:6–21 in the Light of Deuteronomy 4:29–35 (LXX)," *JSNT* 46 (1992): 73–97.

67 van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts."

68 van de Sandt's method can be generally observed, but for a clearer statement, esp. on the source-critical aspect see "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 77.

69 van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 77.

70 van de Sandt's work on Joel 3 in Acts 2 and Hab. 1 in Acts 13 follows similar methodological tendencies. In fact, it is his belief that the Lukan use of Joel presupposes "the original context (the 'pretext') of the [Joel 3:1–5] quotation." ("The Fate," 57) And similar assumptions are made in his conclusions on Hab. 1 in Acts 13 (Cf. van de Sandt, "A Reflection"; "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 70–73).

71 van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts," 74.

72 Richard, "Creative Use."

73 White, "Revisiting."

van de Sandt suggests that this book of the Pentateuch is the proper lens through which the Amos quotations in Acts should be read and particularly the curses and blessings regarding idolatry in Deut. 4:1–31.⁷⁴ van de Sandt suggests that in both cases, Luke replaced the relevant parts of the Deut. 4 curses or blessings with quotations from Amos that are more relevant to his authorial needs in the context of Acts.⁷⁵ Overall, for van de Sandt, it is the prohibition of images in Deut. 4 and its eschatological trajectory that Luke was “reading”⁷⁶ when he retold Israel’s story in Acts 7:38b–43 and Acts 15:16–18, not principally the Amos texts.⁷⁷

In sum, van de Sandt’s argues that in Acts 7:42–43 Luke believes that the prohibition of Deut. 4 has been violated by Israel when they built the calf referred to in Acts 7:41 (ἐμὸς χοροποίησαν). In fact, van de Sandt says that the prohibition of images in Deut. 4:1–28 is fulfilled in Amos 5:25–27, and according to such a fulfillment, the Amos 5 text is effectively the replacement for the earlier Deut. text, for Luke.⁷⁸ In this way, for van de Sandt, the Lukan quotation of Amos 5 should be viewed as an interpretive replacement of a more foundational text, namely, Deut. 4.⁷⁹

In his study on Amos 9 in Acts 15, van de Sandt makes a similar case with regard to Deut. 4 that follows closely the one from above. However, van de Sandt remains certain that this is where the correct meaning for Acts 7 and Acts 15 and their respective Amos quotations rests. His study on Amos 9 in Acts 15 runs into some trouble establishing clear verbal links between Deut. 4 and Ex. 33 (Ex. 33 seemingly a text that is completely unrelated), namely the verbal link between [ζήτέω] in Deut. 4 and Ex. 33 and in Acts 15:17 [ἐκζητέω] and other specific eschatological language in order to establish the Pentateuch as the context where the meaning for Acts 15 rests.⁸⁰

74 The studies on these quotations can be found in van de Sandt, “Amos 5,25–27”; van de Sandt, “An Explanation”; van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 65–69, 73–77.

75 Cf., van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 69; van de Sandt, “An Explanation,” 77–80; van de Sandt, “Amos 5,25–27,” 83–87.

76 van de Sandt’s intentional use of “reading” is helpful, since as Kelsey (*The Use of Scripture in Recent Theology* [London: SCM, 1975], 102) then Watson (*Paul*, 515) point out, a “reading” is far different methodologically than an “exegesis,” since unlike an exegesis a “reading” does not have to account for everything in a text. This potentially makes van de Sandt’s case more plausible, but is not likely the best solution.

77 Cf. van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 66; van de Sandt, “An Explanation,” 77–79.

78 van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 67.

79 van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 69.

80 Cf. “Amos 5,25–27,” 80.

Overall, for van de Sandt, the best method for understanding the use of the TP in Acts is by a method that appeals to a broadly defined “original context” or “original meaning.” This method frequently sends van de Sandt on a journey outside of the Lukan text, and in fact, outside the text of the TP, to the Pentateuch in order to find *the meaning of the TP quotation in the Lukan narrative*. Though van de Sandt makes important observations concerning the place of the TP quotations in Acts and their relationship to each other in some cases, the context of Acts and agency of Luke as an author is roundly ignored. At one point, van de Sandt observes that Acts is distinguished from Luke’s gospel because “Luke was able to shape his story more autonomously than in the Gospel.”⁸¹ However, instead of that observed distinction between Acts and Luke’s gospel leading van de Sandt into a more detailed study of Acts as a unique context that could uncover the meaning of these quotations, his study moves into various contexts within the Jewish Scriptures that echo Lukan language choices.

In addition, the lack of devoted attention to what the literary context of Acts is a problem for van de Sandt. One wonders after reading van de Sandt’s detailed studies if he has actually shed greater light on the function of a given quotation in Acts itself. The level of complexity of verbal connections van de Sandt requires in his exegetical method could lose the forest for the trees, and actually, tend one to wonder if it is Luke’s intertextuality or van de Sandt’s that is under investigation. In the end, the study of Luke’s intertextuality is placed almost exclusively in a broad Old Testament context. More questions must be answered about how the Twelve, the literary context of Acts, and the interpretive milieu in which Luke inhabits (a historical question van de Sandt does not consider) might shed greater light on the function of these quotations in Acts.

11.a.2 Richard Bauckham and James as “the Exegete”

A second form of “exegesis” comes by way of looking at the appropriation of these quotations relative to the context of other early Jewish writings and the interpretive methods of these other writings. It has become common to see such terms as “pesher” and “midrash” used with frequency in reference to the intertextuality of a given NT writer. This is no less true for the quotation of the TP in Acts.

In his 1996 article, “James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13–21),” Richard Bauckham, following in many ways the pioneering work of Richard Longenecker’s

81 van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 62.

Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period,⁸² seeks to uncover the skilled exegesis of the Lukan James by a study that uses first-century Jewish exegetical methods as the key to discovery.⁸³ Bauckham's study is a hermeneutical one attempting to prove that the best way to gain insight on James' Acts 15 speech is via Jewish interpretive and explicitly exegetical methods and uncovering the James ("the exegete" as Bauckham calls him) behind the Lukan narrative. For Bauckham, the speech of James had to that point gained neither adequate attention nor proper investigation in view of the growing knowledge of early Jewish interpretation methods found in new textual discoveries.

Bauckham's method of studying the quotation of Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–18 is marked by the belief that the Lukan James was an exegete of his time and his milieu. Bauckham's belief that James was an "exegete" accounts for every detail in the text of Amos. It even makes the case that James was reading both the Hebrew and Greek texts of Amos.

Bauckham's conclusions concerning the hermeneutics of James "the exegete" have some similarity to those of van de Sandt in that he draws upon allusions to the context of the Jewish Scriptures to explain difficult Lukan alterations to the texts (these will be addressed in the chapter on Amos 9 in Acts 15). But where Bauckham differs from van de Sandt is in his belief that James as "exegete" was heavily influenced by the early Jewish milieu and its exegetical practices, specifically those found in the Qumran pesharim.⁸⁴

The exegesis of the text is important to Bauckham, not of Luke particularly, but of the actual James of Acts 15. He concludes that the historical James in Acts 15 is likely to be the original speaker of the words recorded by Luke because the exegesis of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 shows evidence of a skilled Greek-speaking "Jewish Christian exegete who read both the Hebrew Bible and the LXX."⁸⁵ This is an important point for Bauckham since he often appeals to the Hebrew alternative to the LXX-Amos 9:11–12 text in order to explain Lukan emendations to the text in Acts 15:16–18.

Common to van de Sandt and Bauckham is the use of the term "exegesis." For both scholars, if it is Luke or possibly the historic James, exegesis is at the

82 Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

83 Richard Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13–21)," in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 155. Also, cf. Richard Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids; Carlisle: Eerdmans; Paternoster, 1995), 452–562.

84 Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 157.

85 Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 183, 184.

heart of the Lukan methodology, and exegesis frames the discussion of the context of the appropriated text. Each scholar is not entirely original in their method of exegesis. It has been common in grammatical-historical method to search the Jewish Scriptures for verbal parallels to NT passages in order to give greater clarity to how a given NT author has used a scriptural text. In so doing, one can attempt to account, as van de Sandt does in his work, for every jot and tittle of the appropriated scriptural text, especially those parts that do not immediately line up with the Scripture as it is found in its “original form.”

Also, as noted, Bauckham, who is aligned closely to classic grammatical-historical methods, searches the Jewish Scriptures for parallels to the Lukan appropriation, but his method executes a form of exegesis by appealing to Jewish interpretive methods, following in the same vein as Longenecker’s.⁸⁶ Richard Hays, who is part of our second category, the “conversationalist,” has rightly criticized this method for being anachronistic in its analysis, especially when it appeals to rabbinic exegetical categories.⁸⁷ Bauckham’s appeal to this method is oftentimes more careful than that of Longenecker’s. However, with great similarity to Longenecker, Bauckham couches the Lukan use of Scripture in a form of exegesis best understood via alternative Jewish interpretive and exegetical patterns and largely fails to ask if Luke might be original in some ways in his appropriation of the texts of Scripture to which he appeals. The shortcomings of the “exegetes,” especially regarding their lack of attention to the context of the NT corpus in question and the agency of the writer, lead us to our second category to see if any advancements in hermeneutical methods may enlighten our study.

11.b The “Conversationalists”

The final studies to be examined are considerably more dialogical. Much of the method in this category is based on a conversation with Scripture. So we suggest that they would be called “conversationalists.” Common to the works covered in this category is the use of aural metaphors of echoes, speaking, and specifically conversation to illumine the canonical nature of intertextuality in the New Testament, and the literary and creative agency of the author in the adaptation of the Jewish Scriptures to a new context, as it will be further explained below and demonstrated in the body of the work. The works that fall under this category, first, consist of Richard Hays, most notably in *Echoes of Scripture*

86 Longenecker, *Exegesis*.

87 Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 8, 160, 180–82.

in the *Letters of Paul*,⁸⁸ the later adaptation of Hays' method by Kenneth Litwak for his study of intertextuality in Luke-Acts in *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*,⁸⁹ and the work of Francis Watson in *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*.⁹⁰

Largely, these studies originate in the revival of the literary and theological study of Scripture, and they stand in the shadow and with some relation to canonical approach to Scripture. This approach was made popular by Child and had some roots in Barthian views of Scripture and hermeneutics. He also used aural analogies to articulate his method; namely,

[The Old Testament] is promise, not fulfillment. Yet its voice continues to sound and it has been not stilled by the fulfillment of the promise [in the NT].⁹¹

While not completely convincing to some, the advances that these studies have offered to the understanding of intertextuality have been important to the understanding of the hermeneutics of the NT writers.

11.b.1 Echoes in Paul and Luke-Acts

Richard Hays' work, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, has vastly expanded our understanding of the use of Scripture in Paul and has made an enormous impact on scholarship by being applied to many other NT authors' uses of Scripture as in Litwak's work on Luke-Acts. Hays contends that literary theories specific to forms of intertextuality (with its roots in the respective works on intertextuality by Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes) that have developed are helpful when understanding Paul's epistles.⁹²

11.b.1.A Richard Hays' *Echoes in Paul*

Drawing from John Hollander's paradigm, Hays' controlling metaphor for intertextuality is an aural one, namely, an echo.⁹³ An echo for Hays is basically a trope illustrating that the "old voices," generally, as Hollander says (quoted

88 Hays, *Echoes*. For similar methods from the same author, see also, Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

89 Kenneth Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

90 Watson, *Paul*.

91 Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 77.

92 Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

93 Cf. Hays, *Echoes*, 18–21.

by Hays), “distort the original voice in order to interpret it.”⁹⁴ The resonance of the echoing Scripture in Paul is said by Hays to be best understood “as an intertextual conversation between Paul and the voice of Scripture.”⁹⁵ Though it may be that Hays would not associate his method with Childs, one may notice an important echo of Childs in Hays regarding the “voice” of Scripture. There exists an influence of the normative Scripture, even though a “distorted” one, on the text that receives it. For Hays, there is the importance of discovering that voice in the second text (i.e., the NT text) in order to gain access to Pauline rhetoric and theology.

According to Hays (as per Hollander), the text of Scripture is found in two stages. First, evidence of the source text (the normative text) that is suppressed, or transumed, in points of the resonance that occurs between the two texts. Secondly, for Hays this means that in the intertextual give-and-take that Paul and Scripture have in their dialogue, there is what Hays calls “metalepsis” or essentially “whispered or unstated correspondences.”⁹⁶ Within this space, and according to his literary-critical method of detecting echoes, Hays suggests the reader of Paul can begin to interpret Paul by the texts he cites, how he cites them, and what they imply about the conversation Paul is having with Scripture. Hays attempts the discovery of these “whispers” by seven “tests.”⁹⁷ These “tests” are important for Hays for locating echoes and allusions to Scripture in the Pauline letters, but for our purposes is generally methodologically superfluous since we are concerned with clearly explicit quotations in Acts. Hays’ general aural method of intertextuality is what we are concerned to observe here, and therefore detail on these “tests” will not be covered beyond mention.

11.b.1.B *Kenneth Litwak’s Study on Echoes in Luke-Acts*

As stated, this method of intertextuality has had an important place in NT studies since its publication. Hays’ method of conversation and echo gives latitude to Paul as an author essentially to re-read texts with a degree of freedom of agency not allowed by the “exegetes.” For our purposes, Hays has importantly influenced those who would interpret Lukan texts, specifically Litwak’s work *Echoes of Scripture in Paul: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually*, and his “revisionary reading” of Joel 3 in Acts 2.

⁹⁴ Hays, *Echoes*, 19.

⁹⁵ Hays, *Echoes*, 35, cf. 36. Cf. also, Richard B. Hays, “On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 70–73.

⁹⁶ Hays, *Echoes*, 20.

⁹⁷ Hays, *Echoes*, 29–32.

Following the publication of Hays' work *Echoes of Scripture* by sixteen years, Litwak's PhD dissertation sets out to adapt Hays' method for the study of intertextuality in Luke-Acts. Litwak contends is that since intertextual studies had roundly ignored the echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts, the understanding of Scripture in Luke-Acts and its function therein is insufficient.

Specifically, his thesis rests heavily on the claim that Luke uses both echoes and citations in Scripture for "framing in discourse."⁹⁸ The language for the concept of "framing in discourse" is one developed by Deborah Tannen and is Litwak's version of Hays' transumption and metalepsis. This is a type of "metamessage," according to Litwak, that creates a "narrative framework to understand [a communicative] event."⁹⁹ By studying the echoes in the beginning (Luke 1–2), middle (Luke 24–Acts 2), and end (Acts 28) of Luke-Acts, Litwak seeks to shed light on the Lukan use of Scripture found at these important narrational points.¹⁰⁰

Though Litwak's study filled an important lacuna in the study of intertextuality in Luke-Acts, his methodological execution undermines his aspirations at important points. At some levels, Litwak appears to present false choices that are not present in the texts in question.

First, Litwak's emphasis on echoes as framing mechanisms comes at the price of the value of citations in that same corpus. As one reviewer quite rightly points out, Litwak's echo-oriented methodology leads him to ignore the importance of the explicit quotations such as a programmatic quotation of Is. 61:1,2 in Luke 4:18–19.¹⁰¹ As the title of his work suggests, Litwak (like Hays on Paul) believes the emphasis to be upon ecclesiology.¹⁰² However, the Scripture explicitly quoted by Luke, namely, Is. 61, would suggest aspects of Christology. Such an exclusive theological focus can be problematic, but Litwak's exclusive focus is in part due to his criticisms of other intertextual methods that emphasize the Christological in Luke-Acts, most notably the fulfillment paradigms and proof-from-prophecy methodologies. This example raises concerns that

98 Litwak, *Echoes*, 55.

99 Litwak, *Echoes*, 56.

100 One might note that Litwak's sampling of texts from Luke-Acts bears similarity to Pao's sampling in his published dissertation *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002); both appear influenced by the method and patterns of Conzelmann's *Die Mitte der Zeit*, published in English as *Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke* (London: Faber, 1960).

101 Darrel L. Bock, "Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the Story of God's People Intertextually*," *CBQ* 68 (2006): 153.

102 Litwak, *Echoes*, 155–56, 168–73.

Litwak has created competition between the Christological use of Scripture and the ecclesiological use that may be foreign to Luke-Acts.¹⁰³

The second false choice for Litwak is between a hermeneutical use of Scripture (i.e., “framing in discourse”) that Litwak holds to be the correct view, or “promise and fulfillment” and “proof from prophecy.” For Litwak, the echoes that are used by Luke in his discursive framing are purely ecclesiological, and he places a lot of weight upon the concept of continuity (likely, too much weight). Litwak rightly criticizes Bock’s methodological choice to ignore Scripture in Luke-Acts past Acts 13 since Bock may also be too exclusively binding Lukan intertextuality to one aspect of theology, namely, Christology.¹⁰⁴ However, all too frequently, Litwak’s forceful rejection of the “promise and fulfillment” and “proof from prophecy” uses of Scripture endorses an unfortunate either-or agenda and seems to set up a straw man argument against these views.¹⁰⁵ Such a strongly worded agenda may in some cases lead the reader of Litwak’s study to wonder whether Litwak is *for* the role of echoes in a discursive framing method of scriptural use by Luke which leads to needed emphasis on ecclesiology, or *against* those theological categories outside of ecclesiology, because they are endorsed in a major way by more traditional ways to interpret intertextuality.

For example, Litwak’s analysis of Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2:16–21 follows basically the overall method and its problems as covered above. Litwak’s interpretation of the use of this text is what he calls a “revisionary reading.”¹⁰⁶ At the heart of this text usage is continuity since according to Litwak there is a “symbiosis” between Joel 3:1–5 and the events in Acts 2.¹⁰⁷ However, by the Lukan use of Joel 3 in Acts 2 Litwak takes aim at any notion of fulfillment and proof from prophecy in this text in order then to make a case for a more hermeneutical method of intertextuality.

103 Litwak follows Hays in his heavy emphasis on ecclesiology. He has been challenged on this point. Cf. e.g., Darrel L. Bock, “Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the Story of God’s People Intertextually*,” 153.

104 Cf. Litwak, *Echoes*, 11. Bock believes that the lordship of Christ overall and the Lukan statement concerning Christology had by Acts 13 been firmly established, and therefore intertextuality beyond that point is essentially not progressing. However, we argue below that the use of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15 is actually the pinnacle of scriptural quotation for Christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology in Acts.

105 Steve Walton, “Kenneth Duncan Litwak, ‘*Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually*,’” *BBR* 17, no. 2 (2004): 346.

106 Litwak, *Echoes*, 155.

107 Litwak, *Echoes*, 155.

For Litwak, since Luke has “set [the text of Joel 3] into a new context” that has a messianic context foreign to Joel 3, the Lukan reading is a “revisionary” one.¹⁰⁸ The Lukan use, for Litwak, diverges from the “original plain sense of Joel.”¹⁰⁹ Of course, this is similar language to what the “exegetes” covered above use in their intertextuality. But importantly for Litwak’s study of this passage, a revisionary reading that recontextualizes the text of Scripture means that any notion of “fulfillment” or “proving” must be absent. Almost verbatim, it is Litwak’s case that since there is no verbal evidence of “proof” or “fulfillment” (despite of Acts 2:16; 2:30–31; and 2:36) and no complete one-to-one correspondence between Joel 3 and Acts 2, these two methods of intertextuality are invalid.

Simply put, it seems that Litwak’s understandings of these two categories are rather short-sighted. As we will see below in chapter 1 on LXX-Joel 3 in Acts 2, something is both being proven and fulfilled according to the Lukan use of this text, though the LXX-Joel text is also being used as a programmatic hermeneutical lens for the rest of the Lukan narrative. (Regarding the latter portion of the last sentence, Litwak seems to be correct, and this will be covered in chapter 1). But again, the issues here are methodological wherein Litwak appears to make a type of word-concept fallacy. His error is thinking, “Since the text doesn’t explicitly say something in a literal, verbal way, it is not there.” So, since the text does not use the words “prove” or “fulfill,” neither is possible. Alternatively, as noted already, he at least sets up a straw-man in order to defeat these perspectives. Furthermore, Litwak’s case against these two ways of viewing intertextuality in this instance seems to be further from Hays and closer to the method of the “exegetes” covered previously. For Litwak, since a one-to-one correspondence to the quoted text cannot be established clearly in the receptor text, a “revisionary” reading must be what has happened. The evidence will demonstrate that this assertion is a misunderstanding of how texts are read and appropriated, and seems to misunderstand Litwak’s own methodological choice of echo. Namely, when a text is appropriated, it naturally changes form to whatever use the author intends for it, whether it is fulfillment, proof, or hermeneutical device.¹¹⁰

One might be sympathetic to Litwak’s choice to call Luke’s use of Joel 3 a recontextualization if we also allow that this recontextualization includes the freedom of the author to demonstrate proof or fulfillment of something. As we will contend, readers of texts (even as Hays defines echoes!) do not reproduce

108 Litwak, *Echoes*, 157.

109 Litwak, *Echoes*, 157.

110 Cf. Litwak, *Echoes*, 156–57, 160.

a “literal” or “original” meaning, as “literal” or “original” are typically defined, though this is the way that Litwak would want it to be. However, Litwak’s misunderstanding of received and appropriated texts does not, therefore, preclude what Litwak intends to preclude. Put positively, texts can be used to “prove” and to demonstrate “fulfillment” as the NT writers in many places demonstrate (Matthew, Paul and Luke being very good examples of this), even if they do not follow strict “original” wording, nor seem to align completely with a supposed “original” meaning (since they never will do this anyway!). More can be said on Litwak and his method and the specifics of this text, but it is to the rest of the study that follows to lay out how Luke uses source texts. Namely, how he uses the LXX-TP and why we should not believe that a spectrum of possible meanings for a text is ruled out just because Luke inserts them into a new context and because the verbal analogies are not as tight as one might desire.

Overall, the method suggested by Hays and adopted by Litwak is one that has been very important in the development of the method of the present study and our ongoing investigation of the Lukan use of Scripture in this work. However, the third of the “conversationalists” brings to the table a missing aspect that will enable greater insight into intertextuality, an aspect that even Hays had felt was missing.¹¹¹

11.b.2 Francis Watson and the Three-Way Dialectic

In his pursuit of finding a more precise meaning to Paul’s use of Scripture, Richard Hays took the first step in suggesting plausibly that the NT writer was an interlocutor with the Jewish Scriptures, reading the texts with a greater level of autonomous motive and technique. Influenced by Hays, Francis Watson took one further step in the method of viewing the NT writer as a reader of Scripture. Putting a finer point on Hays’ method, Watson suggests that the NT writer not only has a conversation with Scripture, but that a third interlocutor is present. For Watson, the conviction that Paul is Jewish leads him to include an early Jewish interlocutor into the conversation, who is reading the same text as the NT writer as the third interlocutor. Watson says in reference to Paul’s use of Scripture that the conversation happens on one intertextual field amongst a “reading community” where no monopoly can be claimed.¹¹²

111 Hays, “On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul,” 70–73.

112 Watson, *Paul*, 522. In full, Watson explains,

“Paul ... is a reader of the Pentateuch alongside other readers. He can claim no monopoly on it, for he is himself a member of a reading community characterized by ongoing debate about scriptural meaning and significance. Disagreement does not cut him off from that reading community, even when community can only take the form of mutual

Watson's hermeneutic is shaped by the claim that Paul's theology of justification is a "scriptural hermeneutic," and his view of the law is "nothing other than his reading of the text," namely the consecutive reading of the Pentateuch (which says Watson is recast: "[the] Pauline order [is] Genesis-Deuteronomy-Leviticus-Exodus").¹¹³ Watson believes that Paul reads the narrative of the Pentateuch according to a "construal of the whole from a particular perspective."¹¹⁴ This "construal" is reading from a specific ordering of a corpus according to a theme. This method is quite different from Shepherd's imposed ordering of a specific canon or version or a corpus upon a readership who may probably be reading that canon in different construal or another canon altogether!

Galatians 3 is of central importance to Watson's study and the Pauline reading therein of the Pentateuch in construal. For Watson, particular high-points in the reading of the Pentateuch are seen in Galatians 3 and deal specifically with the tension Paul found between the unconditional promises to Abraham and the conditions of performance that the law requires for life. For Watson, Hab. 2:4, found in both Romans and Galatians, is a type of hermeneutical lens for Paul's reading of the Torah. Watson submits that according to one specific way in which Hab. 2:4 is read, the aspect of promise is stronger than (and successfully overshadows) the law in light of the new covenant. The particulars of the case that Watson makes need not concern us here since that is not germane to our case, but only his method. For our purposes, it is how Watson makes his case that Paul is reading the Pentateuch through a "reading" and a "construal" that takes center stage.

Watson takes the "exegetes" head-on by way of his claim that Paul is a "reader" of Scripture and as such, does not need to take account of every aspect in the text of Scripture he reads. Instead, as an active reader of Scripture, Paul does not engage in as Watson says, "a self-effacing reproduction of an original by way of transcription, translation or paraphrase."¹¹⁵ Rather, Paul is free to interpret as he reads the text. In other words, the interpreter of Paul should *expect* to find difference between Scripture and Paul when exploring Paul's method of scriptural quotation, not because a better explanation cannot be found, nor because Paul misquoted anything, but rather because Paul knows

antagonism. Disagreement can only take place on the basis of an agreed-upon frame of reference, without which it dissipates into incommensurability and indifference."

113 Watson, *Paul*, 2–3, 517.

114 Watson, *Paul*, 515.

115 Watson, *Paul*, 515.

Scripture well and is actively engaged in the process of interpreting its meaning into a new context.

Part of being an active reader of Scripture is the idea of construal. A construal is a method of reading a particular text in light of the whole wherein an engaged reader discerns a pattern. That pattern becomes the hermeneutical lens through which each portion of the greater corpus is read.¹¹⁶ David Kelsey likewise says,

when a theologian appeals to scripture to help authorize a theological proposal, he appeals, not just to some aspect of scripture, but to a pattern characteristically exhibited by that aspect of scripture, and in virtue of that pattern, he construes the scripture to which he appeals as some kind of whole.¹¹⁷

Watson uses this method of construal when he makes the case that Paul is reading the corpus of the Pentateuch or Torah when he is writing Galatians 3.

For Watson, a construal means that Paul can read the Pentateuch in a particular way, highlight the tensions found in the Pentateuch, and resolve that tension with the result that, according to Watson, the pattern of promise is victorious over the pattern of condemnation of the law. Paul moves freely within the Pentateuch to make a case for a particular redemptive-historical perspective. In fact, Watson pulls out and lists the high-points of Paul's summary, and though he claims that these points do not seem to be a cogent interpretation of Torah according to the exegetes, Paul as a reader of Scripture makes Galatians 3 an interpretation of Torah "in outline."¹¹⁸ This is also why Paul's construal presents a different ordering of the Torah from the one even plausibly contained in Paul's canon and certainly ours.

But with his method, Watson runs into some important criticisms related to Paul's reason for reading the text this way and what that says about the Pauline hermeneutic and perspective.

11.b.2.A *Responses to Watson's Conversational Hermeneutic*

A couple of significant criticisms have been lodged against Watson. First, though he has high praise for Watson's project, Hays challenges the relative

¹¹⁶ Watson also calls this a "deeper logic of the text." *Paul*, 159–60.

¹¹⁷ Kelsey, *Use of Scripture*, 102.

¹¹⁸ Watson, *Paul*, 517.

nature of Watson's reading of Paul.¹¹⁹ Hays has problems with Watson avoiding the "truthfulness of Paul's hermeneutic."¹²⁰ Using Watson's own arguments in other hermeneutical works of his against his argument in *Hermeneutics of Faith*, Hays is fundamentally concerned that Watson has not firmly established what he feels is the truth mediated in the texts of Holy Scripture.¹²¹

The second criticism is one that picks up where Hays leaves off on his first objection. As noted above, it was Hays that first raised concern about Watson's reticence to establish the truthfulness in the Pauline hermeneutic. Hays says this is seen in his less-than-thorough assessment of Paul's Trinitarian theology, as seen in Romans 10.¹²² Watson's method may not take serious account of the 'Jesus-factor' in intertextuality, which may imply that any in the milieu of Paul or Luke may have reached the same interpretive results as Paul and Luke have despite worldview and theological conviction.

According to his belief that no one voice is allowed to dominate the conversation, Watson is reticent to claim that one voice is the correct one over and against the others. But might this hermeneutic not lead Watson away from fully considering the weight of Paul's Christological persuasion, and Luke's as well, as is the germane hermeneutical concern of this study?

In sum, it is important to notice that in two important places, Watson's caution about the Christological aspect of the Pauline reading is explicit and confirms the worries of Hays. First, he notes that Paul's exegesis is characterized by "marked Christological reticence."¹²³ And secondly, concerning those prophets that Paul cites, he says, "their testimony to God's saving act in Christ can only be indirect."¹²⁴

11.b.2.B *A Way Forward by Synthesizing Major Virtues and Critiques of Watson's Method*

At the heart of the critique of Hays is the question concerning the fruit of comparison between the Jewish writer and the Christian reader, and what makes the Christian reader distinctive from the pre-Christ Jewish reader?

119 Richard B. Hays, "Paul's Hermeneutic and the Question of Truth," *PE* 16, no. 2 (2007): 126–33.

120 Hays, "Truth," 133.

121 Hays, "Truth," 133. Here Hays is quoting from Francis Watson, *Text, Church, and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 292–93.

122 Hays, "Truth," 133. For a similar criticism of Watson's methodological tendency in this direction see, Christopher R. Seitz, "Christological Interpretation of Texts and Trinitarian Claims to Truth: An Engagement with Francis Watson's Text and Truth," *SJT* 52, no. 2 (1999): 209–26.

123 Watson, *Paul*, 21.

124 Watson, *Paul*, 21.

Watson's hermeneutic for reading Paul is his fundamental claim that "Paul was a Jew," and not, as some might view Paul as a Christian first, or at least a Jewish-Christian. The direction of reading the intertexts is thus informed by the how one views the religious convictions or identity of the interpreter, Paul; Watson reads forward—normative text to Jewish reader to Pauline reading (though in a less linear conversation), while others might first read Paul to understand the intertext.

The direction one reads intertexts affects the way they view the original interpreter's identity; in this case, Paul. This seems no less true in Watson's method of intertextuality. Regarding these differing opinions on the significance of Paul's Christian identity, Watson seems aware of the relationship between "Jew" and "Christian" and potential divisions that the "revelatory hermeneutical event" caused by the lordship of Christ can have between these respective interpretive parties.¹²⁵ But it seems likely that Watson believes that the dialectical model in his method can "negotiate that difference." The criticism lodged by Hays is that there is little difference between Paul and a Jewish reader when the two are reading the same text.¹²⁶ Understandably, this is a method that brings about pause for those who see Paul as a Christian first and, therefore, one who would read the text through a fundamentally different set of lenses than a Jewish reader.

When the Acts is taken in consideration vis-a-vis the disagreement noted above, the issue is not best located in identity *per se* (i.e., Christian or Jew), but rather in the context in redemption history, or "time-in-the-story," so to speak (hence, "last days," and "the day of the Lord" in Acts 2:16–20). Scholars like Jacob Jervell have made a compelling case that the reader of Acts observes a hermeneutic informed not as much by identity but rather ecclesiological division.¹²⁷ The difference between the Jewish reader and Christian reader originates in how one interprets Scripture in the context of the historical moment in which they stand—the time of Jesus' work and ascension to Lord and reigning king. In Acts, it is a matter of who is in the *laós* of God and who is not, which is not a matter of birth or, therefore, ethnicity but confession of Jesus as Lord.

Accordingly, Watson appears to know that the time-and-place has major importance, but it does not seem to strongly sway his judgment (though, arguably Paul is the wrong place to look for such a thing, since even according to a canonical reading of Scripture, each piece plays its role, as NT writers

125 Watson, *Paul*, 532.

126 Watson, *Paul*, 533.

127 Jacob Jervell, *Luke and The People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1972), 41–74.

affirm. Cf., e.g., 2 Peter 3:14–16). Watson acknowledges that the interpretation of Scripture by the early Jewish reader and Paul will be different, and it is possible that Watson could be read as saying that the difference is because both live in separate “worlds.” He says,

The function of canonical scripture is to enable the interpreter to make sense of the world of contemporary experience, and not simply to assign an ‘original meaning’ to a text: in the end it is the world rather than the text *per se* that is the object of interpretation.¹²⁸

But that Watson concludes that his method, even in light of such a statement, essentially negotiates any significant difference between the early Jewish reader and the Christian one is problematic. In fact, contrary to Watson, a fundamental thing that Luke is taking head-on with his belief that by the ascension of Jesus the world has entered into the “last days.” It is best not to view “Luke as Jew” (to some a debated identity of the Luke the physician) like Watson looks at Paul, but “Luke as ‘last days’ dweller, writer, and thinker in light of the work of Jesus of Nazareth.”

Interpreting Scripture in the “last days” and what that means for the central figure, Jesus, brings with it a truth-statement. Though the unfolding study below will not be one of the “trinity” *per se*, trinitarianism is at the heart of Luke’s agenda in Acts so far as the case that Jesus is the Lord as YHWH was Lord, and the day of the Lord is inaugurated by Jesus’ ascension and is, therefore, his day. It is this “day” that is also at the heart of the Lukan reading of the LXX-TP. Similarly, other interlocutor texts saw a messiah come and rule, but Luke will be shown to stand out since the Messiah Luke speaks of takes on the role as Lord. The Lukan construal of the Greek Twelve Prophets in Acts gives unique scriptural support for a messiah like this one.

Therefore, despite Watson’s study on Paul, the evidence in this study will challenge the view that Luke is interested at any level to negotiate the difference between him and others (as others have made convincing cases for according to other methods and against other suggestions¹²⁹). Instead, the evidence will point to the fact that the historical setting exegeted by Luke has a bearing upon all people.¹³⁰ The context influences the identity of the reader

¹²⁸ Watson, *Paul*, 4.

¹²⁹ Cf. C. C. Kevin Rowe, *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), who argues that Luke’s agenda, *pace* the influence of the Tübingen School, was not to demonstrate political peace between the early and Rome.

¹³⁰ Alan Thompson (*The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus: Luke’s Account of God’s Unfolding Plan* [Downers Grove: IVP, 2011], 18) correctly calls the inauguration of these days, Luke’s

and the decisions that one is making concerning what is true in that process of reception in time, space, and the unfolding of how they perceive God's plan for his people. Deciphering what this day means vis-a-vis the LXX-TP for Luke more sharply is the role of the interlocution with one from another context and not a journey towards making readings of texts relative.

II.c *Summary*

In the end, with proper critique and some necessary adjustments, Watson's method is a helpful reaction against the "exegetes" noted above whose error is to unduly weight one of the "voices" with the result that a careful reading of each text on its own terms is lost, and results can be skewed. Therefore, his method is one that will prove handy as a way to approach intertextuality.

In this study, Watson's method will be utilized and appropriated in terms of its major tenets—three interlocutors, the rule and proper understanding of the normative text, and its particular construal of that normative text (i.e., the LXX-TP) in the Book of Acts. The model of a "three-way conversation" will best highlight how Luke's reading of the LXX-TP spells out more clearly how the "world" Luke interprets and the context in which God's people now stand (a point emphasized most recently by Alan Thompson¹³¹), play a crucial role in contrast to the one that the early Jewish readers' have inhabited.

In summary, the hermeneutical advancements offered up by the "conversationalists" out of a canonical and literary methodological legacy improve upon many of the short-comings of the "exegetes" from above. Interaction with the "exegetes," however, will remain a key component to the exploration of this study. Interaction will occur with them along the way where they help clarify the text, but also where they seem to fall short of clearly explaining the Lukan appropriation and free reading of the scriptural texts and his overall agency as an author of a text. But for now, it is sufficient to suggest that the approach of the "exegetes" is not a method that will help to best clarify the place of the LXX-TP in Acts.

It is now our task to move from our assessment of two broadly categorized methodological strategies that have held importance in Lukan intertextual studies to the statement of method that follows; one that places Luke in a conversation with Scripture and his contemporaries as a meaningful way of making a case for the lordship of Jesus.

"organizing framework for integrating [his] overall emphases in Acts," and a statement on God's redemptive-historical work in the world.

131 Cf. esp. Thompson, *The Risen Lord Jesus*, 50–51.

III A New Study on the TP in Acts

The quotation of the TP in Acts is exceptional compared to its regular quotation in the rest of the NT. The TP in Acts stands among Isaiah and the Psalms as the most often quoted in Acts. And the evolving way that modern biblical scholarship understands the TP, namely, as a single corpus with a unifying theme, makes it more comparable to these other corpora with reference to being quoted as one book rather than twelve separate prophecies. Additionally, the space allotted to this corpus in Acts is curious. The TP are given the most space in Acts according to word count. And if these simple objective observations about the TP in Acts are so, the question remains, why? Why is it quoted so often and given so much space in a relatively to-the-point account of the early church? What does this tell us about the Lukan use of this corpus in Acts? And what is its role in the narrative?

The other two most quoted corpora in Acts, the Psalms and Isaiah, have had works devoted to them that have enlightened us on their purpose in Acts (many of these studies covering the role of these corpora both in Luke and Acts).¹³² Could a similar work on the TP do the same for our understanding of the Lukan use of Scripture and his understanding of the “last days” documented in Acts? At least according to the way that the TP are quoted in Acts as we have covered already above, there is reason to believe that the preliminary answer to this question is “yes.” But this is not the only reason for why this study presently offered is needed concerning this corpus in Acts. A study of reception will also distinguish this study from others done before it and will

¹³² On Isaiah cf. e.g., Pao, *New Exodus*; Peter Mallen, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2008). On the Psalms cf. e.g., David Sloan, “The Understanding of the Psalms in Luke-Acts,” unpublished doctoral dissertation (Deerfield: Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2012). Though not contributing anything at a book-length, Peter Doble’s devotion to the Psalms in Luke-Acts is notable in “The Psalms in Luke-Acts,” in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 83–117 and “Luke 24.26,44—Songs of God’s Servant: David and His Psalms in Luke-Acts,” *JSNT* 28, no. 3 (2006). Also, though not necessarily on the Psalms specifically, see Yuzuru Miura’s work on David in Luke-Acts is notable (*David in Luke-Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007]). Finally, Darrell Bock’s work on OT Christology (*Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* [Sheffield: JSNT, 1987]), though also not specifically on the Psalms or Isaiah, covers the quotations from these corpora through Luke’s Gospel up through Acts 13 (which, according to Bock’s method, effectively leaves out treatment of the explicit quotations following Acts 13, namely, Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15 and Is. 6:9–10 in Acts 28).

be what allows this study to offer new knowledge to the field of Lukan studies broadly and the use of Scripture by Luke in a slightly more focused way.

III.a *A Dialogue about the Twelve Prophets among Readers*

At its core, the method of this study is a comparative analysis of reception of the Jewish Scriptures with a focus on the Lukan appropriation Scripture in Acts.¹³³ In order to make the best sense of the Lukan appropriation of the TP in Acts we will analyze the relationship between three bodies of literature: (1) the narrative of Acts, (2) the four TP quotations that are found in Acts, and (3) the early Jewish texts that appropriate the same TP texts as Luke.

It is without a doubt that Luke is being affected by the texts he reads and the milieu in which he stands. However, he is not also being influenced in a major way by these other voices. He is, in fact, part of a dynamic process of reception that looks less like a line, for example, from the Jewish Scriptures to early Jewish writings to the NT corpus. Instead, it is like an everyday conversation, though with much higher stakes, that engages in a natural give and take between sounding voices that claim ground but give ground where interpretive issues germane to the context of the reader demands it. Though like the hopes of a normal conversation, no single voice eliminates another, but each has its stance and its case to make in light of the stance and case of the other.

Our goal is not simply to look at the quotations as they appear in Acts, but hear the conversation among the three voices about these quotations to uncover new understandings or reaffirm previously held interpretations of these TP quotations in Acts with new clarity. In sum, we are looking to get to the interior space of the conversation about the TP between Luke, his milieu which is quoting the same text, and the quoted text itself, the normative text, whose voice still resounds, as Childs reminds us, saying: “[OT] is promise not fulfillment ... yet its voice continues to sound ...”¹³⁴

Watson rightly notes that typically in the past, the three bodies of literature noted above have been treated in relative isolation from one another when studied “with only a superficial sense of their interconnectedness.”¹³⁵ This way of treating the text undermines the process of reception that texts go through

¹³³ The method of this study is guided by many of the assumptions of the canonical approach to Scripture by the important works done by Brevard Childs (e.g., *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985]; *Biblical Theology*; “Canonical Shape of the Prophetic Literature,” *Int* 32, no. 1 [1978]: 46–55), Hays (esp. *Echoes*). But the method of this study works closely with the method offered up by Francis Watson in his work on Paul and Scripture (*Paul*).

¹³⁴ Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 77.

¹³⁵ Watson, *Paul*, 2.

when later interpreters read them according to their own context. More modern ways of approaching hermeneutics have illuminated the task at hand—namely, of asking what Luke is doing with the four quotations of the TP in Acts and according to what contexts do they gain their meaning. Hays got the Old and the New talking in new and innovative ways, but did not include that third voice; the voice sounded by texts of the Jewish milieu. Watson added this voice.

Similar to Watson's understanding of Paul reading the Pentateuch "in community" as a singular corpus from which he draws a unique thematic thread, we suggest Luke is reading the TP "in community" as a singular corpus according to a certain construal and logic of its whole. By getting the three voices "talking to each other," the task is to avoid the pitfalls of studies that would give us, for example, "the Minor Prophets according to the interpretive milieu of The Second Temple Jewish texts." By getting Luke talking with another conversation partner who is interpreting Joel 3:1–5 as Luke is in chapter two of Acts, we will reap greater rewards than a broad study of the TP in the early Jewish milieu, since much, if not most of the data would simply be ancillary to the purpose of our study. The conversation is focused and has a trajectory to getting Luke talking with relevant interlocutors who will better reveal how it is that Luke uniquely reads the TP in Acts.

Furthermore, the method of a dialectic suggests the proper authority of the scriptural text. The normative text, again as Childs posits, is still speaking and has something to say about how it is read. Luke and his interlocutor are reading a text that holds authority over them and the normative text speaks back in conversation on the movement that its readers make up and down the spectrum of its potential meaning. As a corpus, the TP are read by Luke, and as Watson defines a "reading": "[it is] a construal of the whole from a particular perspective."¹³⁶ In light of the voice of the normative text, it is likely that we would best understand the use of each TP quotation in Acts according to the understanding of all of the TP quotations in Acts, from one source and according to how Luke reads them in each location within his narrative. However, it is the task of this study to find out if this is the case.

III.b *Setting the Stage for the Lukan Use of the Twelve Prophets*

The ultimate context in this study is Acts since this is a study on Luke's use of Scripture in Acts. The quotations of the Twelve Prophets exegete this context, which is characterized by the internal world of the literature of Acts itself and the historical moment of the early church that Luke reports.

¹³⁶ Watson, *Paul*, 515.

However, two other important contexts set the stage for how to best grapple with how Luke quotes the Twelve Prophets in Acts. Briefly, the first context is the theological meaning Luke draws from the Twelve Prophets as a unified corpus and construes for his own use in Acts. Our question will be if Luke faithfully construes the TP according to its meaning, or if Acts as context would even allow him to do so. The second is a three-way conversation between Scripture, Luke, and another reader of Scripture. This context acts as a hermeneutical control. But more than that, it gives us a window into the internal dialogue of a tradition of reading texts. We will simply look at four representative texts in this study with whom Luke will engage. But the observation of how these co-readers interpret a text alongside of Luke will move us from flatly two-dimensional intertextuality that sees Luke reading Scripture in a vacuum, into more robust and realistic intertextuality that properly situates Luke in a dynamic tradition of reading and applying Scripture to a new context.¹³⁷

The former context sets the spectrum of theological meaning for later readers and for their use of that meaning.¹³⁸ The assumption is that the later reader would stay faithful to that meaning. Although when we say faithful, we do not mean that boundaries will not be pressed, nor do we suggest that the author will slavishly follow any preconceived notions of “original context.”¹³⁹ Instead, faithfulness to a text will take on what the Scripture says and what the new context demands, pressing the logic underlying the meaning of Scripture. The latter context locates each reader on that spectrum of theological meaning as they weigh the demands that their historical and literary context places upon them vis-a-vis the demands made by the meaning of the Scripture and the context from which they are drawing it. We will cover these below in order to flesh out fully our method of study.

III.b.1 Construing a Unified Twelve Prophets for a New Context

Marvin Sweeney says of the current landscape of scholarship on the Twelve Prophets:

Recent years have seen a major shift in discussion concerning the Twelve Prophets, in that scholars are now beginning to move beyond the older literary-critical paradigm, which treats the Twelve Prophets as individual prophetic books, to a newer literary-critical paradigm, which examines the Book of the Twelve as a coherent literary whole.

¹³⁷ Cf. Watson, *Paul*, 129–30.

¹³⁸ Cf. Watson, *Paul*, 125–26.

¹³⁹ Cf. Watson, *Paul*, 128–29.

Sweeney's comments are representative of a majority of modern prophet scholars who claim that the most natural and historical way to read the TP is in literary or redactional unity, including those such as Paul House, Paul Redditt, Aaron Schart, Rolf Rendtorff, James Nogalski, et al.¹⁴⁰ In fact, many agree that one cannot get back to a time before these prophets began to be associated literarily to another.¹⁴¹ This should, and, in reality, does have a profound effect on how we view quotations of the TP by later authors. Indeed, that which unifies the TP certainly sets an important bar for how Luke reads the TP in his context, if one assumes he reads it faithfully (which will of course be a major question we will be attempting to answer as we analyze the Lukan appropriation of Scripture against the backdrop of various contexts that influence his use).

Some conclusions about the formation of the TP emerge clearer than others. Indeed, much left to be discovered and debated about the formation of the TP. Jones observes there is still "disagreement on the origin of the book and the kind of literary activity that produced it."¹⁴² Though it is impossible in a study such as this one to take up the current debates surrounding the formation of the Twelve, it is worthy of noting that the field is yet settled on topics such as theology of the Twelve Prophets, the more authentic order of the Twelve concerning the Greek, the Hebrew,¹⁴³ or the possible third way from Qumran, a la Barry Alan Jones,¹⁴⁴ how themes among prophets relate, and so on. In fact,

140 See Nogalski and Sweeney, *Reading*. For a history of scholarship on redactional and literary unity see Jones, *Formation*, 14–42. Watson (*Paul*, 87–88) seems to want to hold that there was a unifying aspect of the Twelve, even at a very minimal level, that made it an important corpus "second only to Isaiah," but he does not want to go as far as Schart (*Zwölfprophetenbuchs*, 28) and others who suggest a unity that is marked by a coherent theological narrative.

141 This view is normally first attributed to Steck in *Der Abschluss der Prophetie Im Alten Testament: Ein Versuch Zur Frage der Vorgeschichte Des Kanons* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991). For more on the formation of the TP see e.g., Nogalski and Sweeney, *Reading*; Nogalski, *Literary Precursors*; Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*; House, *The Unity of the Twelve*; Schart, *Zwölfprophetenbuchs*. Russell Fuller, "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve: The Evidence from the Judean Desert," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts*, ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 86–101.

142 Jones, *Formation*, 40.

143 For example, Watson (*Paul*, 80–88) gives a thorough treatment of alternative orders of the Twelve. His study is helpful at many points, but one could wonder if in a study of reception that looks for a "deeper logic" (Watson's words) if knowing the authentic order is really necessary. It is true that Joel (as we observe below) can just as well be the theological "anchor" of the Twelve from its second place in the MT, as it can from number four in the Greek version.

144 Jones, *Formation*.

the major substance of those issues will have to be left to studies cited in this section and further scholarship on prophecy to discuss and defend. For our purposes, we will take the lead of the current majority of prophet scholars that propose that the TP has, since its earliest written stages, formed into a corporal unity, and plausibly a literary unity as well. We will inquire into the major implications of that unity so as to guide this first context that informs Luke's use.

It is generally agreed by those who view the Twelve as holding at the very least a literary unity that the book of the Twelve Prophets is formed around the theme of the day of the Lord. The day of the Lord is a theme that receives the most robust treatment by this body of prophecy among the prophetic books of the Jewish Scriptures. Indeed, it is a theme that often appears elsewhere in the prophets as "the day of the anger of the Lord," "that day," "the day when," etc.¹⁴⁵ But the Twelve gives the theme its singular focus. It indeed is a distinctive trait of this corpus.¹⁴⁶ Further, Watson suggests at the conclusion of his lengthy treatment of the Twelve in a work on Paul and faith that

By about the mid-first century BCE, the Twelve seem to have enjoyed a privileged role as interpreters of 'the end of days'—the period in which members of the [Qumranic Essene] sect were living.¹⁴⁷

The period to which Watson refers would include also Luke and his contemporaries.

The theme of the day of the Lord is constructed from the very basic building blocks of the judgment of the Lord and salvation offered by the Lord in the day where all will be visited by his presence. These building blocks always have reference to how one stands before the Lord in his day of judgment. Those who stand before the Lord are not always Israel, and Israel is not always on the side of the angels. In fact, one of the major hermeneutical issues that we will address in our chapter on Joel 3:1–5 is the question of "all flesh." The day of the Lord is a day that is universally felt and experienced, and the announcement of that day in the Twelve Prophets comes at moments when Israel is both being defended from or warned of judgment, and likewise when the nations are being judged for their actions against Israel and Israel's God, or on the contrary, being offered salvation from judgment. In sum, the basic building blocks

145 Richard Hiers, *The Day of the Lord*, ed. David Noel Freedman, ABD (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 83.

146 Cf. e.g., Rendtorff, "Alas for the Day: The 'Day of the Lord' in the Book of the Twelve"; Barton, "The Day of Yahweh in the Minor Prophets"; Nogalski, "The Day(s) of YHWH in the Book of the Twelve."

147 Watson, *Paul*, 111.

of this day are actually quite nuanced and couched in very difficult to interpret prophecies.

How the blocks have been built together, as noted already, is still debated. Many have offered different ways to tie the prophets together into a literary unity; many of these studies being helpful.¹⁴⁸ If we are using theological themes or catchwords to tie each prophecy together, the order of the books can have an effect when we consider the relationship between prophetic books according to the respective orders observed in the Greek Twelve and the Hebrew Twelve. Jones¹⁴⁹ has demonstrated along with the work of Nogalski¹⁵⁰ the importance and complexity of the interrelated themes. For our case in Acts, Amos 9:11–12 may be affected the most by the differing orders and thus the ways catchwords relate.¹⁵¹ In light of these debates, helpful thematic threads have been offered up that are important when observing in a study that would propose that Luke is making his own theological use out of this corpus.

Rolf Rendtorff, in his article called “How to Read the Book of the Twelve as a Theological Unity,”¹⁵² is one who shows the common thread of the day of the Lord through the Twelve. Beginning with Joel, he invites the reader to “follow the first thread that runs through almost the whole of the Book of the Twelve: the Day of the Lord.”¹⁵³ For Rendtorff as well as other scholars like Nogalski, Joel anchors the Twelve and its agenda, especially related to its day of the Lord prophecies that reach their peak in 3:1–5 (ET 2:28–32).¹⁵⁴ Nogalski says that

148 Cf. e.g., House, *The Unity of the Twelve*; Paul R. House, *Dramatic Coherence in Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996); Redditt and Schart, *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*; Paul L. Redditt, “The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Review of Research,” in *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, ed. Paul L. Redditt and Aaron Schart (Berlin: De Gruyter), 1–26; Paul L. Redditt, “The Production and Reading of the Book of the Twelve,” in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 11–33; Rolf Rendtorff, “How to Read the Book of the Twelve as a Theological Unity,” in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 75–87.

149 Jones, *Formation*, esp. 170–220. Jones interacts with Nogalski (Nogalski, *Literary Precursors*) and the MT catchwords in this section, and gives a good example of how simple catchwords can, with great complexity, affect debates on canonical ordering, the possible translation technique of the Greek translator, and theological flow. Amos 9:11–12 will be covered more fully below in chapter 4, but still not at the depth of redactional study that can be found in Jones and Nogalski.

150 Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*; Nogalski, *Literary Precursors*.

151 Jones, *Formation*, 175–92.

152 Rendtorff, “How to Read.”

153 Rendtorff, “How to Read,” 78.

154 James Nogalski, “Joel as ‘Literary Anchor’ for the Book of the Twelve,” in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, ed. James Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 91–109; Rendtorff, “Alas for the Day: The ‘Day of the Lord’ in the Book of the Twelve”;

Joel “forms a necessary ... interpretive key for unifying major literary threads in the Twelve.”¹⁵⁵ The role that Joel plays in the Twelve is important to highlight since it will be the first, if not also anchoring, quotation of the Twelve in Acts 2 when Peter quotes Joel 3:1–5 at Pentecost.

Joel is the first of the Twelve to introduce the topic of the day of the Lord, and the prophecy does so with a “collection of many views.”¹⁵⁶ The day of the Lord comes upon Israel first (Joel 1–2), but soon after all the nations (Joel 4). The day of the Lord, according to Joel, is a day that comes upon all flesh. Though a theological tension is made when Joel 3:5 also purports to offer salvation universally, as well. A divine Spirit grants a limited few safety and salvation from the day of the Lord, but it is likely that this group is simply made up of Israel.¹⁵⁷

Moving from Joel, Rendtorff suggests connection between Joel and Amos (while also treating Obadiah and Jonah) by the theme of the day of the Lord (Amos 1:2, 14; 2:16, etc.). Israel is judged on that day for not “seeking the good.” Again, the prophets suggest that there is still an outside chance that the Lord may relent (cf. Amos 5:14–15), which results in theological tension for the reader of these prophecies. Rendtorff observes that Amos’ call to “seek the good” comes not as an isolated case, but is tied up in Joel’s call to repentance in the day of the Lord (cf. Joel 4:6, 8–11). Themes and questions of Zion and locusts in the day of the Lord likewise tie these two prophets together under the banner of the day of the Lord’s coming, Rendtorff says.¹⁵⁸ Finally, the nations find themselves in the crosshairs of judgment in Amos. For them, it is a “day of battle” (cf. Amos 1:3–5).

Regrettably, he gives no comment on the fascinating yet also a very puzzling positive ending of Amos and how that portion of Amos fits the unifying theology of the Twelve. Amos as a whole is a rather oppressive and negative prophecy of judgment, but at the end of chapter 9 there is hope. The rebuilding of the booth of David is the hope of those saved in the day of the Lord. The hopeful ending of this prophecy throws light on the positive end of the day of the Lord. Much like in Joel, there are rings of universal salvation. Ostensibly, the remnant that will be saved in the day of the Lord for Amos is not simply made up of Israel. This is like Joel. More will be said about this strangely positive ending to Amos in our chapter on LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15.

Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*, 275–78. And see the brief work Walter K. Price, *The Prophet Joel and the Day of the Lord* (Chicago: Moody, 1976).

155 Nogalski, “Joel as ‘Literary Anchor’ for the Book of the Twelve,” 92.

156 Rendtorff, “How to Read,” 78.

157 Rendtorff, “How to Read,” 79. See chapter one on LXX-Joel 3:1–5 for a more detailed analysis of these issues.

158 Rendtorff, “How to Read,” 81–82.

Rendtorff moves swiftly to a discussion of Obadiah and Jonah and how these two prophecies also relate to the theme of the day of the Lord. Similar to Joel and Amos, for Rendtorff, Obadiah is a prophecy centralized around the day of the Lord. As one might observe in Joel, themes of Israel's greatest and oldest enemy Edom/Esau emerges (Obad 18–21; cf. Joel 4). The day of the Lord for Obadiah is not a confusion between either Israel or the nations. The Lord's judgment without question targets the nations (Obad 15). But much like Amos is to Israel, there is an offer of salvation to the nations in Obadiah. A saying that sounds much like a quote from Joel 3:5, Obadiah says that "there shall be those who escape" (Obad 17). The central issue, Rendtorff says, is an issue of lordship. It is only the Lord that rules and not humans.¹⁵⁹ That message is directed to Israel and anyone else. This is the crux of the matter and an important tie between the day of the Lord in Amos (cf. 5:18) and Obadiah (cf. 21). Again, there are hints of universalism in Obadiah, like the rest.

Without overburdening the issue at hand, suffice it to say that Rendtorff continues to draw out the theme of the day of the Lord in Jonah, then in Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah, and finally Malachi 3. In this final portion, Malachi ends the Twelve with a clear declaration of the coming day of the Lord. With many analogies to that day (cf. 1:16–17; 3:19; 3:20–21), Malachi suggests that the day of the Lord is the culmination of the Torah and the Nabiim by naming Moses and Elijah (4:4–6).¹⁶⁰ Might this be enlightening to how we read the Twelve in Acts by virtue of the way that Luke introduces Acts from his gospel in Jesus' words on the road to Emmaus (cf. Lk. 24:44)?

For Micah, like we saw in Joel as the anchor of the Twelve, the day of the Lord is ultimately one of calling upon the name of the Lord so one might escape judgment. Rendtorff concludes: "This reconciliation will be necessary in order to avoid the eschatological judgment."¹⁶¹

An important nuance to be recalled is that Luke is a reader of the Greek Scriptures. It is understandable then that the overwhelming amounts of data would suggest that he was reading the Greek Twelve Prophets. The language of the Twelve, may it be Hebrew or Greek, does not drastically change the overall thrust of the Twelve. The day of the Lord is the central theme of the corpus. It will be important in the study that follows to pick up on areas that the Greek may depart significantly from the Hebrew, just as we will ask questions

¹⁵⁹ Rendtorff, "How to Read," 82–83.

¹⁶⁰ For more on how Malachi "frames" the ending of the Twelve as a unit, see John D. W. Watts, "A Frame for the Book of the Twelve: Hosea 1–3 and Malachi," in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, ed. James Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 209–17.

¹⁶¹ Rendtorff, "How to Read," 86.

of Luke when he departs from his Greek *Vorlage*. However, as noted above, Watson spends a good deal of space discussing what order of the Twelve may be authentic.¹⁶² But if we suppose that a later reader of the text, like Luke or Paul or the Essene community are construing the overall corpus into a deeper theological logic according to a pattern they discern as active readers of the text, then does order or unity matter?

Unity of the corpus and theological meaning of the text is primary since this gives the later reader boundaries for interpretation. The order does not rank nearly as high. This does not mean, however, that order will not matter at all, as Jones' study on Amos 9:12 has shown. But as we progress we will keep an eye on two methodological details, as we consider that Luke uses a unified Twelve: (1) Luke begins with and anchors his narrative in Joel, and (2) Luke's use of the Greek Twelve does bring into play a significantly redacted version of Amos 9:11–12 in its Greek version,¹⁶³ which Luke turns around and also redacts quite significantly. Our other two quotations will also carry significant weight in the theme of the day of the Lord in Acts, but our first and last quotations are particularly important in showing cohesion among the four and their function in Acts.

III.b.2 The Three Voices in the Dialectic and Their Respective Roles

The second context is a three-way conversation among Scripture and its readers. There are three voices in this conversation.

(1) The first voice of the conversation is of Luke in Acts. For Luke, the stated purpose for writing Acts remains the same from his gospel, namely, "certainty." He desires that the reader of Acts would be certain of what has been taught about Jesus, his anointed lordship, and later the ministry of the Holy Spirit through his chosen apostles (cf. Lk. 1:1–4; Acts 1:1–3). One of the primary ways Luke brings certainty is by viewing the events of the early church through the lens of the careful exegesis of Scripture (cf. esp. Lk. 24:44). The reality in which the earliest church stood is explained by Luke via a scriptural hermeneutic, and this intertextual aspect becomes clearest in Acts with the explicit quotation of selected texts of which the TP are some of the most quoted.

Though this study will be spending more time outside the Lukan text than is normally observed in the majority of NT studies, the primary focus remains the Lukan text and more specifically, the Lukan reading of the TP in Acts. These quotations as the explicit intertextual dimension (words borrowed from

¹⁶² Watson, *Paul*, 80–88.

¹⁶³ This issue will be discussed below at much great length, but for more on this see Jones, *Formation*, 175–91.

Watson) in Acts are studied with the expectation that Luke is using these selected texts to enlighten the student of Acts about a specific part of the grander shape of a new era in God's redemptive-historical plan.

The treatment of the Lukan use of the TP will be according to the order in which they are found in Acts. This study will move sequentially through Acts and study the quotations as such. If we grant that Acts is following a logical story-line, it seems best for to study the quotations in the order and within the context that they are presented in the text. The narrative of Acts and the major theme of "the day of the Lord" that is a governing theme of the book is an exegetical construct. This means that Acts is a product of Luke making sense of his world (that is, exegesis of his context) and communicating how he does so with scripture at the heart of this construct, utilized to exegesis his day.

(2) The second focus of this study is with early Jewish texts that are using the same TP texts, Luke's co-readers. It is important to note the integral role these texts play in this study, which is also notably different from the general way these texts are used in many NT studies. The appeal to these texts is not to reconstruct an "early Jewish" or "Second Temple" interpretation of the TP that may superficially serve as a "foil" to the Lukan text¹⁶⁴ or only have a general overlap with the overall purpose of this study; both only further isolate this body of texts from its interaction with the Lukan text. This type of reconstruction normally happens in an early chapter in NT investigations and routinely has little actual connection to the evidence presented in the rest of the study.

With regards to the non-Lukan early Jewish texts, an important observation is made by Watson, namely, that this early Jewish body of literature not only differs from the Lukan text in its appropriation of the Scripture, but the texts that make up this body of literature involve internal hermeneutical differences. Therefore, it is important for our study to select exemplar texts that offer alternative interpretations from Luke for these texts to best play their role in our comparative study.

For our purposes, the exemplar texts that are set in conversation with Luke have been decided for us since they are the only extant texts that contain quotations from where Luke also quotes. This both makes our task less convenient in the choices we have to compare to Luke, but it also positively makes it more honest in that the lack of convenience makes us grapple with potentially more difficult hermeneutical issues.

That being said, the aim is to treat these early Jewish texts with the same careful exegesis as we do the Lukan text. By careful attention to the nuanced ways that these texts receive the TP, we can bring to the fore evidence that

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Watson, *Paul*, 3.

would make a comparison via a three-way dialectic with the Lukan text fruitful for our overall study of the Lukan appropriation in Acts. This will be executed by studying an exemplar text in each of our chapters in one section of each chapter with each chapter including a setting of said exemplar text in conversation with the Lukan appropriation of the normative text. Again, this approach will be more illuminating to the contribution of studying the literature of the early Jewish milieu in relation to Acts. Such a process serves to produce a better understanding of the place of the TP *in Acts* than a single chapter on a possible topic such as “the early Jewish reception of the TP.” These studies and their broad conclusions generally do not relate to the text in question and in most cases, appear to serve better a study of the normative text than the receptor text being studied.

(3) Our third area of concern will be with the Jewish scriptural texts of the Greek Twelve prophets themselves. Watson correctly says, “We must read the texts for ourselves if we are to interpret the interpreters.”¹⁶⁵ That is, we must come to our own conclusions about what the normative text says before we presume to make any conclusions about the meaning that is received by any later reader, Luke or otherwise.

Even though this is a NT study and primarily a Lukan one, close attention must be given to this step of exegesis rather than assuming a certain interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures that would be compared to the Lukan one without clear reason or evidence present from exegesis of the normative text. Additionally, “the interlocutors,” i.e., the Lukan and selected early Jewish texts, engaged with Scripture with the belief that it was through the lens of Scripture that their contemporary world was interpreted. This means, first, that both of these texts can be viewed as working in a single intertextual spectrum anchored by the same normative text to which they appeal. Therefore, the comparison of these texts “takes place on that common ground”¹⁶⁶ with a commonly available semantic range and with a common concern for the interpretation and application of the same texts. Second, this means that this “common ground” says a lot about what these texts were looking to as their authority, namely, a normative text.

The principle of normativity means that the text which Luke and the selected early Jewish texts appeal to constrains the reader, though each text may differ in how it realizes the semantic potential of the normative text. The text is not merely “a blank screen” that the reader can “project their various

¹⁶⁵ Watson, *Paul*, 3.

¹⁶⁶ Watson, *Paul*, 3.

concerns,¹⁶⁷ or agendas upon, as Watson observes in other methods than his own.¹⁶⁸ Of course, this understanding of normativity of texts works against the notion that the text would be inappropriately manipulated by later readers of that text. Rather, this view of normativity would suggest that the assumption would normally be that varying readings are at their core readings realizing the meaning potential of a text at a different place in its spectrum of meaning. What should be noted here, finally, is that it is the normativity of the text that constrains its later readers. This should not be taken as it is in methods that hold the “original context” of the normative text of Scripture to any degree of authoritarian control over its latter appropriation. It is also different from placing a generally observed interpretive method (such as Rabbinic Midrash) in the place of a ‘hermeneutical dictatorship’ over a given later interpreter of Scripture, a method suggested in the past and critiqued.¹⁶⁹

The meaning of being “constrained” by the normative text is actually quite different than the expectation that any later reader, may it be Luke or an early Jewish writer, is in strict continuity with the verbal or thematic meaning of the “original context” (or in continuity with each other due to a supposed shared hermeneutic). Instead, when one is “constrained” by the normative text there is actually a great deal of interpretive freedom to move about a given semantic spectrum that allows for varying appropriations of a particular text. Any continuity (or discontinuity for that matter) between interpreters is integrally related to a shared spectrum of meaning.

The importance of understanding the norming function of the Scriptures in this way is demonstrated by its broadness rather than the narrowness of potential meaning. This suggests that there is room to move along a prescribed spectrum of meaning for the application, and appropriation of Scripture to varying contexts, though confines are laid down by the normative nature of the scriptural text itself. This aspect is an integral characteristic of Scripture and its role as a normative text as Childs has argued in the past.¹⁷⁰ This means that one should be slow to deem a reader who realizes the meaning potential of a given

167 Watson, *Paul*, 4.

168 Contra the general method and thesis in Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing With Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

169 Most notably, Rabbinic modes of exegesis, primarily proposed by Richard Longenecker (*Exegesis*) have often served a normative method for interpreting NT quotations of Scripture. This has been rightly criticized by many, but most clearly by Hays (*Echoes*, 8, 160–62, 180–82). It is true that many NT writers quote Scripture in similar ways to Qumran and later Rabbis, but it cannot be proven that each NT writer would be using specific rules of midrash to quote Scripture (contra Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 18–30). A first-century model of exegesis is just one of the contexts that must be considered.

170 Childs, “Canonical Shape,” 47.

scriptural text, even an extreme potential, as wrongly applying or quoting an earlier text. Instead, it is better to begin a study with the assumption that a particular difference in interpretation is merely different due to their appropriation of the text, a difference in interpretation that asks for closer analysis and a more nuanced comparison to ask what the context demanded of the writer.

Where this leads us is to a method that can assess the “three voices” in the “conversation” as Watson said (and Hays before Watson),¹⁷¹ recovering the dynamic process of reception, and no longer requiring those who would receive a scriptural text to reproduce a text according to a “narrowly circumscribed original meaning”¹⁷² or confining “original context” (what Watson calls “a text that remained unread”¹⁷³). This method of intertextuality attempts to get to the inside of the conversation to hear what each “voice” says, and how they uniquely interact. Each text has a distinct voice and contribution to make, and we are wise to hear that voice to hear Luke better.

We should, therefore, expect that this distinct voice sounds in differing and unique ways as it is appropriated according to the needs of the contemporary context of those later texts that use it. As with the previous two bodies of literature, our endeavor is to investigate fully the normative text with as much care as the former two texts so that its voice is heard best as it still sounds, and so we can hear it sound in its unique ways as it is appropriated by later readers.

III.c *The Process of Hearing Each Voice and Its Interaction with the Others*

In the end, it is the task of this study to explore the dynamic process of reception that Luke was a part of by virtue of appealing to a normative set of scriptural texts, the TP. In order to do so, this study will explore the interactions between Scripture (S), the Lukan text (L), and the early Jewish texts (J) in a format similar to what follows:¹⁷⁴

- (1) S
- (2) L <—> S
- (3) J <—> S
- (4) L(S) <—> J(S)

¹⁷¹ Cf. Watson, *Paul*, 2–5; Hays, “On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul,” 70–73.

¹⁷² Watson, *Paul*, 5.

¹⁷³ Watson, *Paul*, 4.

¹⁷⁴ Watson, *Paul*, 4.

(1) Our model slightly departs from Watson's stated method at section #1, Scripture (S). His model only includes #2–4 (of course, as #1–3), but the execution of his study looks more like what is laid out above. This method of study is a helpful corrective to the slight attention and care that the Jewish Scriptures have gained in NT intertextual studies. Therefore, a baseline will be set by the exclusive and careful study of the normative scriptural texts first. In this way, we can best interpret the text appealed to by the interpreters in questions as noted above (which is observable in the execution of Watson's method, but is not an aspect included in his visual schematic).

In this section, we will observe the texts that our interlocutors were reading. Most often for the sake of the Lukan text we will observe the theology and literary place of the quotations as they stand in the Greek text, commenting on the grammar and verbal aspects of words where necessary. As it stands with commentaries and commentary writing, the Greek text of the Old Testament is underserved. However, we hope to get closest to the meaning of the Greek text that Luke would have been reading. Therefore, standing behind our study, though not always appearing in the footnotes, is the consultation of specific resources such as the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS), Brill's *The Septuagint Commentary Series*, Muraoka's latest lexicon and grammar on the Greek OT, the relevant volumes of *La Bible d'Alexandrie* (BdA), and *Septuaginta Deutsch*, among other resources. In other cases, appeals to commentaries and studies that are generally on the Hebrew text are made to attempt to judiciously decide what is or is not relevant to the broader theology and themes of the text as it is found in the Greek version.

(2) Following the study of this textual body, our attention turns to the question of the Lukan appropriation of the normative TP text. It will be our task to see what demands the Lukan and narrative context places upon the TP texts that Luke selects and in what ways the semantic range of these quotations are used by Luke to bring "certainty" according to the needs of his narrative context.

(3) Similarly, the early Jewish appropriation of the same TP quotation will be explored with the same questions as asked of the Lukan appropriation. For both texts, it is as Watson says about the investigation of reception, that canonical Scripture is for the purpose of explaining the experience of the context of the interpreter authoritatively. As such, an "original meaning" can be too constrictive to the student of these ancient texts if the normative text is assigned too great an authority over the receptor of that text¹⁷⁵

175 Cf. Watson, *Paul*, 4–5.

(4) Finally, the interaction between the respective appropriations of the Lukan text and of the early Jewish one will be assessed. This is what sets this “intertextual” study apart from others that have ever appeared on the TP in Acts.

In this final section, we will observe an explicit interaction between two authors regarding their reading of the same text. We can observe the readers as they move along the lines of the same intertextual field in order to appropriately exegete their respective contexts with the text of Scripture. Here the notion that two distinct interpretations of Scripture are irreconcilable may be challenged. As Watson says, interpreters can be “located within a single intertextual field—despite of their interpretive differences, but precisely because of them.”¹⁷⁶ However, reconciliation may not always be possible for texts, and their differences will be helpful for our purposes for gaining knowledge about how Luke used Scripture to make claims of truth about his context.

In light of this interaction, we will engage in a careful comparison of these texts with the hope that it will lift to the surface similarities and differences between the respective appropriations of Scripture for greater insight into the Lukan use but also helpful insights into the early Jewish use of the same texts.

Last, this section will end with a brief summary of what our study of reception has told us, specifically, about the Lukan reception since that is of primary concern to our study. This part will assess and challenge past suppositions about the Lukan appropriation of a given TP text in light of the evidence gleaned from the comparison. It will challenge the notion that Luke is bound to the normative text’s authorial intent that in some way “knew of a final fulfillment in the New Testament” as it is often assumed in modern intertextual scholarship. The Jewish voice and their reading will challenge such linear thinking by a more dynamic process of reading in community and tradition.

iv The Argument and the Direction of the Study

A case has been given above for the need for a full-length study of the LXX-Twelve-Prophets in Acts. These quotations stand out as distinguished in Acts for many reasons. We hope to ask in light of what has been examined above: Did Luke have a specific purpose for quoting from the LXX-TP? Does understanding the purpose of each quotation in light of the whole (namely, the four other TP quotations) give the student of Acts greater access to

¹⁷⁶ Watson, *Paul*, 5.

understanding Acts as a whole? Finally, how does understanding the function of these four quotations in light of the contexts laid out above change things?

Alan J. Thompson has made a convincing case in an important study, that “Luke intends his work to be read in the light of OT promises and the continuing reign of Christ,” and the inauguration of the last days as the “organizing framework” of Acts.¹⁷⁷ Central for Thompson is the hermeneutic of the lordship of Jesus for understanding Acts. This is the most natural and sensible way to read Acts, since the theme is nearly a self-evident reality. In fact, this hermeneutic informs the trajectory of this study integrally. It will be our task to demonstrate that *Luke discerns the pattern of the day of the Lord in the Twelve Prophets, and by four representative texts he adopts and adapts this particular theme to support Jesus as the universal Lord in the long-awaited day of the Lord.*

In the following chapters, each quotation of the TP in Acts is examined in the order they appear so that the heart of the Lukan reading of the TP and the version of redemptive-history stemming from a reading of the TP in Acts might be better grasped. In doing so, we will observe that the Lukan progression of redemptive history uses a particular theological reading, or construal, of the LXX-TP to mark important redemptive-historical turning points in the narrative exclusively. From Acts 1 to 15, Acts moves from a church without a Lord to an ascended one that has lordship over all of the earth, even extending over uncircumcised Gentiles and traversing locales where synagogues have no lawful authority.¹⁷⁸ As the day of the Lord is at the heart of the TP according to their own voices, the Lukan construal of this corpus (that being, Joel, Amos, Habakkuk, Amos) gives rise to a fresh reading of the TP that is also concerned with the Lord—waywardness from him, his salvation, and his people in the last days—fulfilling the words of the prophets according to how Luke sees it.

In four chapters, the quotations of the TP in Acts will be studied:

Chapter One explores LXX-Joel 3:1–5 (2:28–32) in the narrative location in which Pentecost is documented (Acts 2:17–21, 39) with the purpose of demonstrating that LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is used by Luke to reveal a messiah who reigns as Lord, as YHWH reigns. By appealing to witnesses that will be explained in this chapter, Luke shows that the Lord expected in the day of the Lord spoken of in LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is the messiah Jesus. In this chapter, the exemplar interpreter that Luke’s use of Joel 3:1–5 will be compared with is that in *The Testament of Judah* chapter 24.

¹⁷⁷ Thompson, *The Risen Lord Jesus*, 17, 18.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Jervell, “Future,” 104–10.

Chapter Two explores the study of the LXX-TP in Acts and then will move to a point in the narrative where the Jerusalem mission comes to a close by virtue of the outbreak of persecution. It is in this context that LXX-Amos 5:25–27 is used by Luke. The purpose for this quotation is to demonstrate by the analogy between how the temple was being perceived in Luke's day and Israel's paradigmatic Golden Calf idolatry that God's chosen messiah is one who reigns in a way that is beyond the jurisdiction of the temple and its institution. In this chapter, the exemplar interpreter that Luke's use of Amos 5:25–27 will be compared with is The Damascus Document (CD-A), specifically CD-A 7:16.

In Chapter Three, our investigation turns to a narrative context that is now outside of Jerusalem. In this chapter, it will be our task to demonstrate that the use of LXX-Hab. 1:5 is one that demonstrates a Lord that reigns over all people as they are. That is, the "work" spoken of in Hab. 1:5 is one that astonishes the Lukan Paul's audience because it shows that it is God's work to offer Gentiles *qua* Gentiles salvation outside the system of the Law of Moses and away from the synagogue institution. The Gentile "invasion" in LXX-Hab. 1:5 is for Luke the Gentile "inclusion" by God under Jesus' reign. In this chapter, the exemplar interpreter that Luke's use of Hab. 1:5 will be compared with is 1QpHabakkuk 1.16–2.10.

Finally, in Chapter Four, we will explore the final scriptural quotation in Acts.¹⁷⁹ The quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 brings Luke's scripturally based case for Jesus' lordship to an end. In this chapter, we will grasp how Luke makes evident that the complete fulfillment of earlier prophecies found in his gospel by Simeon (2:29–32) and by Jesus' pre-ascension commission in Acts (1:8). His lordship is one that is "on the move" about the nations, as per Chance,¹⁸⁰ and one that brings a multi-national people under his rule by the call of God. By the LXX-Amos 9 quotation, the explicit experience of the young church from the narrative point of Acts 8 is solidified as the Lukan James' exegesis affirms the divine visitation told of by Peter, Paul and Barnabas at the Council as Jervell has said (though, of course, as noted this is a reality expected in other predictions in Luke's gospel and Acts). In this chapter, the exemplar interpreter that Luke's use of Amos 9:11–12 will be compared with is 4QFlorilegium (=4Q174) 1.12.

179 A simple caveat for this point is offered in chapter four since, in fact, Ex. 22:8 is appealed to by the Lukan Paul in the presence of the high priest in Acts 23:5 in a perfunctory manner and Is. 6:9–10 brings the narrative of Acts to a close (28:26–27).

180 Cf. J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, The Temple, and The New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer: Peeters, 1988), 20–21.

“I Will Pour out My Spirit”: Jesus the Lord and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2

The Text of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and of Acts 2:17–21¹

LXX-Joel 3:1–5

¹ Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται, ² καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου. ³ καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ, ⁴ ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἶμα πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. ⁵ καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται ἀνασφύζομενος, καθότι εἶπεν κύριος, καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται.

¹ In this chapter and each of those that follow (2–4), the text of the *Vorlage*, how it appears in its original context and how it appears in Acts, is provided for the reader's reference with minor textual notations on major variants between the source text and the how it appears in Acts. Our simple text notations will appear as follows: In those places in the Acts where a word has been inserted into the quotation of the source text, the word will appear in **bold**, and **bold-italics** if it has replaced another word. Where there is a change in tense, number or case of a word, the word will appear in *italics*. Where there is a missing word or phrase from the source text without a replacement in Acts, empty brackets will appear (i.e., []). Where there is a transposition, the text in Acts will be in SMALL CAPITALS. The Greek-OT text is largely based on Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), and the text of Acts on Begründet von Eberhard, et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th Edition* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013). Major critical editions have also been consulted for each of the texts; for the *Vorlage*, Joseph Zeigler, *Duodecim Prophetae*, Septuagint: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum XIII, 2nd. Ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), and for the text of Acts Holger Strutwolf, et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior Band III Die Apostelgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017). Since this study is not primarily textual in its focus, a detailed analysis of the text will not be observed. The cited critical editions are recommended to the reader for reference.

Acts 2:17–21

- 17 καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός,
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα,
καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν
καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται.²
- 18 καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν.
- 19 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω
καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω,
αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ.
- 20 ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος
καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἶμα,
πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.
- 21 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

I Introduction

The citation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 (= 2:28–32)³ in Acts 2:17–21 is the first quotation from the Book-of-the-Twelve in Acts. The investigation undertaken in

-
- 2 The “young men” and the “old men” simply exchange places in the Lukan quotation; the “younger men” appearing first in the Lukan text, but second in the Vorlage.
- 3 Like the other Book-of-the-Twelve quotations covered in this study, the LXX-Minor Prophets text closest to the A-group is Luke’s text of choice (cf. Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 166; Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 287–88) van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 57–58. However, though it will not be a focus of this chapter, LXX-Joel does not vary too far from the Hebrew (MT) tradition due to the typically close mapping (but not always, as we will see as our study progresses through other LXX-TP passages) of the Greek Minor Prophets to the Hebrew (cf. George E. Howard, Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., “To the Reader of the Twelve Prophets,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007], 777). Finally, in one of the more thorough treatments of the textual differences between LXX-Joel and the Lukan appropriation, Steyn notes that the textual form of the Lukan use of Joel is closest to LXX-Joel than MT-Joel (saying that the LXX-Joel form is close to the A-group (*Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* [Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995], esp. 76–90; cf. also Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 157–67; Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas* [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1969], 46–55); but he does emphasize that the Lukan rendition of LXX-Joel 3:1–5, in fact, “differs at several points” (*Quotations*, 72 n24). He seems to affirm Kilpatrick’s (“Some Quotations in Acts,” in *Les Acts Des Apôtres: Traditions*,

this chapter is on this quotation, its role in the Lukan Peter's speech, and importantly, its function as a building block in the story-line of Acts.

The significance of LXX-Joel in Acts 2 has not been underestimated. It has routinely been considered the hermeneutical lens through which Luke would have his readers view the rest of Acts.⁴ Notably, Haenchen has called it "berühmtest Zitate!"⁵ It certainly plays a significant role in the beginning stages of Acts, and its language its referenced time and time again as Acts plays out.

On the surface, the Lukan Peter appears to quote the LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in order to explain the significance of the supernatural phenomena that the crowd is witnessing during the Pentecost event, i.e., foreign tongues, thought by some to be drunkenness.⁶ Certainly, without his further explanation in 2:22–39, the quotation itself would remain as mysterious as the signs at Pentecost. So one should look further into the context of Acts wherein this quotation is lodged, specifically the explanation in 2:22–39 in order to better understand why the Lukan Peter believes LXX-Joel helps him make sense of his context, the day of Pentecost. Further, we must ask how Luke is appropriating this text in this part of Acts, and how does he make use of the critical language in LXX-Joel 3:1–5? Afterward, the question of context turns to Luke's interpretive tradition and milieu, where a specific interlocutor, *The Testament of Judah*, is inquired into similarly in order to throw light on the Lukan appropriation that is not immediately evident from Acts itself.

Many purposes for the use of Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2 have been proposed. The Holy Spirit has often taken center stage in similar investigations into LXX-Joel 3 in Acts 2. Notably, Mainville bases her method upon the belief that the key statement about the Holy Spirit in Luke is the appeal to LXX-Joel 3:1–5.⁷ Others

Rédaction, Théologie [Gembloux: Duculot, 1979], 82; see Steyn, *Quotations*, 72 n24) supposition that the quotation is "anonymous" in relation to a source, but in the end affirms the A-group view. We will move forward with the assumption first noted here, but will analyze the differences between LXX-Joel and its appropriation in Acts when major differences affect meaning.

- 4 Cf. e.g., Odette Mainville, "Jésus et l'Esprit Dans L'Oeuvre de Luc?: Éclairage À Partir d'Ac 2:33," *Science et Esprit* 42, no. 2 (1990): 193–208; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 267; van de Sandt, "The Fate," 56–57. Also see a bibliography of studies in Steyn, *Quotations*, 64.
- 5 Ernst Haenchen, "Schriftzitate Und Textüberlieferung in Der Apostelgeschichte," *ZTK* 51, no. 2 (1954): 161.
- 6 Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 251.
- 7 Mainville, "L'Esprit". Cf. also, Turner's thorough study *Power*, with Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 251.

have suggested mission⁸ or the ascension.⁹ With these emphases in mind, it is the task of this chapter to evaluate the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in order to better understand what Luke intended this normative text to say about Pentecost and its possible implications for further stages in his narrative.

The case this chapter makes will be articulated in more detail in section III below that deals closely with the Lukan appropriation. But in brief, the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is intended to explain the events at Pentecost caused by the outpouring of God's Spirit as the eschatological sign which is the fulfillment of the day foreseen by the prophet Joel, namely, the enthronement of Jesus as Lord upon the throne of David by the sole agency of God and witnessed by prophets.¹⁰

Nevertheless, before exploring the Lukan text, we must first consider the normative text which Luke is using, namely, LXX-Joel 3:1–5. This step ensures that we are interpreters of the text ourselves, much like Luke and *The Testament of Judah* 24 were when they received and appropriated Joel 3 for their context. This first step of our investigation will give us the best outcome when we attempt to conclude the text utilized by Luke first for ourselves, and not through an interpretive mediator.

II "I Will Pour out My Spirit": LXX-Joel 3:1–5

LXX-Joel 3:1–5 (=2:28–32) constitutes a significant transition for the prophecy of Joel. With the words, "And it shall be after these things," Joel 3:1–5 foretells a time when a new stage of history is reached in God's plan for his people. Crenshaw calls this anticipated era "the rejuvenation of despoiled nature through YHWH's spirit ..."¹¹

Contained in LXX-Joel 3:1–5 are some of the most universalistic themes "unparalleled in the Old Testament"¹² and a programmatic statement for Israelite prophecy about the day of the Lord and essential developments in pneumatology. Most importantly, this passage has a robust salvific motif that is integrally wed to the real presence of the Lord evidenced in the pouring out of God's

8 van de Sandt, "The Fate."

9 Eric Franklin, "Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," *SJT* 23, no. 2 (1970): 191–200.

10 Franklin, "Ascension," 192, 195, 200.

11 James L Crenshaw, *Joel* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 164, cf. 171.

12 John Barton, *Joel and Obadiah: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 96. Cf. also James Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve: Hosea-Jonah* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2011), 238.

Spirit upon “all flesh,” the Spirit’s effects upon those it is poured upon, and signs of his presence.¹³

Central to the backdrop of Joel’s eschatological prophecy in LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is the day of the Lord.¹⁴ The statements in this passage on the day of the Lord and in the broader prophecy lead some to believe that Joel’s prophecy is the literary “anchor” and a unifying theological motif for the Twelve Prophets.¹⁵ However, the nature of the day of the Lord in Joel remains challenging to define as it can be in its other occurrences in other prophetic locations.¹⁶ One can detect two initial things that characterize this day, according to Joel. First, this day is still anticipated at a future yet imminent moment in history, and second, the Lord himself is present in a tangible way as the primary actor in a day of salvation.

For the prophet, the realization of days of things spoken of in Joel 3:1–5 remains future. The phrase ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα (“after these things”) is the LXX-Joel translation of the Hebrew for אַחֲרֵיכֵן וְהָיָה (“afterward”) which calls to mind other similar texts in Israelite prophecy (cf. Is. 2:2; 3:18; 4:2; Amos 9:11, etc.).¹⁷ Some debate has centered on what “after these things” means since the phrase is rare in the Jewish Scripture.¹⁸ Some have seen “after these things” to be marking a new set of miscellaneous prophecies, types of “afterthoughts.”¹⁹ Others, however, have suggested that the phrase indicates a new era following a time of judgment by God.²⁰ Similarly, Wolff has taken a more natural

13 Cf. Crenshaw (*Joel*, 164) who says that the emphasis in 3:1–5 is “on human repentance that activates divine compassion.” In view of Joel’s message in 3:1–5, it may be that Crenshaw may have placed ‘the cart before the horse’, *per se*, but he correctly senses the burden of the passage is on salvation from the Lord.

14 For a more detailed analysis of the day of the Lord in Joel, see Willem S. Prinsloo, *The Theology of the Book of Joel* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985), esp. 35–36, and Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 33–34. For a broader treatment of the day of the Lord in Israelite history and writing see Hiers, *The Day of the Lord*.

15 Rendtorff, “Alas for the Day: The ‘Day of the Lord’ in the Book of the Twelve”; Rendtorff, “How to Read”; James Nogalski, “The Day(s) of YHWH in the Book of the Twelve,” in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (1999), 617–42.

16 Cf. Ronald Simkins, *Yahweh’s Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel* (Lewiston: Mellen Press, 1991), 244. Also see an extensive bibliography on the subject in Oswald Loretz, “Regenritual und Jahwetag Im Joelbuch” (Altenberge: C1S-Verlag, 1986), 77–79.

17 Cf. Crenshaw, *Joel*, 163–64; John J Collins, *Joel, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013), 24.

18 The phrase that LXX-Joel translates to μετὰ ταῦτα, אַחֲרֵיכֵן, only occurs in 2 Chr. 20:35; Jer. 16:16; 34:11. However, in the Greek scriptures μετὰ ταῦτα occurs more frequently at 97 times, but only one other time in the LXX-Twelve Prophets (Cf. LXX-Hos. 3:5).

19 Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 93. Crenshaw (*Joel*, 164) is overtly skeptical of a method like that of Barton’s.

20 Willem A. van Gemeren, “The Spirit of Restoration,” *WTJ* 50, no. 1 (1988): 84–87.

reading of the text stating that the events of Joel 3:1–5 are prophetic promises that are in “expectation of the much greater future response.”²¹ Wolff reads Joel 3:1–5 within its literary context in the most natural way, which leads to a better conclusion about the time to which the text is referring. His view is also the one that seems most supported by the eschatological use of the phrase in the LXX-Twelve-Prophets. The phrase μετὰ ταῦτα is common in the Greek Scriptures occurring 97 times, but in the LXX-Twelve Prophets it occurs only here in LXX-Joel 3 and in LXX-Hos. 3:5. For LXX-Hosea, μετὰ ταῦτα also anticipates a future age and is eschatological in its focus (cf. LXX-Hos. 3:5, ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν). It seems best, then, to regard μετὰ ταῦτα as pointing to a yet unfulfilled age as we supposed above.

But what is being fulfilled? For Wolff, what the prophet means by “after” is a type of eschatological-chronological movement from the “assurance oracles” in Joel 2:12–27 to a time of a people who repent. He says, “[‘After’] presupposes that the preceding assurance oracles of plea-response pertaining to the earlier time have already been fulfilled ...”²² Naturally read, the future time indicated in Joel 3:1–5 gives a perfect illustration of what it looks like for those oracles in 2:12–27 to be fulfilled in a day foretold by the prophet.

Secondly, for Joel, what defines this future age is God’s tangible presence and exclusive action. As noted earlier, Crenshaw calls this age “the rejuvenation of despoiled nature through YHWH’s spirit ...”²³ It could just as easily be said that LXX-Joel 3:1–5 looks forward to a time where God could be said to “return to his people after *his* despoiled presence, and thereby rejuvenating some by the outpouring of his spirit.” The Lord’s presence is most clearly seen in his solo performance of protecting his people from his judgment. This performance is marked by the outpouring of his Spirit, the effects his Spirit has on his people, and the theophanic signs surrounding his people on earth and in the heavens.

The day described by LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is clearly governed by the Lord’s action. LXX-Joel 3:1 says by the mouth of the Lord, “... I will pour out my spirit.” The natural antecedent of “I will pour out” (ἐκχεῶ) is, of course, “the Lord your God” (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν) in 2:27. This action is reiterated for emphasis in 3:2, accounting for an inclusio, which works to emphasize God’s generous pouring out of His Spirit.²⁴

21 Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 65.

22 Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 65. Cf. Marvin A Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), 173.

23 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 164.

24 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 164, 167. Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 71.

Joel's prophecy of the outpouring of God's Spirit and its results are closest to expressions of Moses' desire for all to have prophetic gifts (Num. 11:29), the promise of a new heart (Jer 31:33–34), and the promise of the Spirit in other prophecies (Ezek. 11:19–20; 36:26–27).²⁵ According to Joel 3:1b–2, the gift of the Spirit is not limited by age, gender, social status, or nationality. The implication the gifts given to those who have the Spirit poured upon them in 3:1b–2 is that the Lord is present in his Spirit.²⁶ This reality is most closely seen in that all are given direct access to inspiration from the Lord.²⁷ The direct relationship the Spirit creates between God and his people echoes Eden and the direct relationship Adam and Eve had with the Lord.²⁸ In both instances (Eden and Joel's eschatological vision), the Lord's presence is known by an intimate revelation from the divine to humanity. The eschatological outpouring of the Spirit upon this broadly defined group directly fulfills Moses' wish noted above and will transfer the Lord's character to his people by his intimate inspiration.²⁹

Finally, Joel says that the Lord is present with fearful signs. The Israelite tradition of the day of the Lord is that the Lord would come as a warrior king to fight his enemies.³⁰ The language in Joel 3:1–5 has regularly been recognized as language characteristic of theophanic events in Israel's history.³¹ Such signs upon the earth and in heaven given by the Lord (δῶσω τέρατα) in 3:1–5 seem to be a precursor to the battle promised in Joel 4 from his seat in Jerusalem.

Earlier in Joel 2:2, the day of the Lord is described as a day of “darkness and gloom, a day of cloud and fog” (ἡμέρα σκότους καὶ γόφου, ἡμέρα νεφέλης καὶ ὀμίχλης). This theophanic imagery is echoed here in Joel 3:4 as a day where the “sun shall be turned to darkness and the moon to blood ...” (ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφῆσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα). But the theophanic tradition that the prophet

25 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 164.

26 Cf. Turner, *Power*, 277.

27 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 164.

28 Cf. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 174–75. Joel actually refers to Eden imagery earlier in his prophecy in 2:3.

29 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 165.

30 This is the view of Gerhard von Rad (“The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh,” *JSS* 4, no. 2 [1959]: 97–108). Cf. also James Luther Mays, *Amos: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 104–5 and Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1989), 521.

31 Simkins, *Yahweh's Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel*, 253. Cf. also Hiers, *The Day of the Lord*; Meir Weiss, “The Origin of the ‘Day of the Lord’—Reconsidered,” in *Hebrew Union College Annual* (1966), 29–71; Klaas A. D. Smelik, “The Meaning of Amos 5:18–20,” *VT* 36, no. 2 (1986): 246–48; Raymond B. Dillard and Thomas Edward McComiskey, eds., “Joel,” in *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); Dillard and McComiskey, “Joel”.

echoes in 3:4, as Nogalski has observed, is likely an appeal to an even earlier period of Israel's history and experience of the God who comes to defend his people and save those who would escape.³²

The Lord's presence is seen in these signs and has important implications for the prophet. For Joel, these implications are borne out in Joel 4 in the Valley of Decision. Simkins observes the relation that 3:1–5 has with the apocalyptic battle described in Joel 4 (esp. 4:15; cf. Zeph 1:15), saying,

Joel understands the effusion of Yahweh's Spirit to be a vital aspect of Yahweh's salvation, particularly that salvation which accompanies his day ... A more immediate context within which to set these phenomena however, is the convulsions of nature caused by the theophany of Yahweh, marching out as the divine warrior in the repetition of the cosmogonic battle on his day.³³

The Lord is seen as the primary actor in his day by these tremors that point to his physical presence, manifested explicitly in battle and among his people in eschatological peace (cf. 4:12,14,18–21).³⁴

Essential for Joel is the universality of these signs, but there is also importance in the specificity of the location from which they emanate. Joel tells us in 3:5 that the signs of the day of the Lord come from Jerusalem (cf. 4:16, 17, 20). Signs are not insignificant details for Joel. It is known to be indicative of the universality of the Lord's active presence³⁵ and the salvation of God's people (3:5; 4:16,17, 20–21).³⁶

32 Nogalski (*Hosea-Jonah*, 230) fills this out further, saying,

"[Joel often] evokes theophanic language often associated with the escape from Egypt, presence at Sinai, and the wilderness wandering. Simultaneously, it elicits fear of the presence of YHWH (cf. Exod. 19:16; Deut. 4:11)."

Cf. also, Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 72; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 174.

33 Simkins, *Yahweh's Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel*, 217.

34 Cf. Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 64.

35 Jones, *Formation*, 210. Jones says,

"Jerusalem is the center of both divine and human activity in the Book of Joel. It is the place of Joel's proclaimed assembly and fast (2:1, 15), the place of refuge on the day of Yahweh (3:5), the place of Yahweh's judgment against the nations (4:16), and the place of Yahweh's eternal dwelling (4:17, 21)."

36 Hengel (*Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 59) classically points out,

"Jerusalem was not only the 'gateway to eschatological salvation but at the same time the centre of all missionary efforts in connection with Judaism ... Anyone who wanted to address all of Israel had to do so in Jerusalem."

Properly cast, LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is the effort of the Lord to draw in all those who would escape to his shelter away from his enemies. Moreover, he chose to act before a worldwide audience from a specific location.

However, this raises probably one of the stickiest issues concerning this text: Who does the Lord address with his offer of shelter and salvation from judgment? Of specific interest is what the referent of “all flesh” is in LXX-Joel 3:1 in the broader context of a prophecy that seems “fleshly particularistic.”³⁷ Joel seems to keep his reader guessing. Some have taken up the opinion that “all flesh” is indicative of the Lord’s future plan to save all “Judahites.”³⁸ In the stream of the prophecy up to this point, this seems like the best option. Also, in view of a surface reading of the people groups involved in the battle described in Joel 4, this opinion seems consistent with the future reality (cf. 4:1, 16–21).

But some have challenged this view, noting that “all flesh” is consistently universal elsewhere in the Jewish Scriptures. Barton interprets “all flesh” in the 3:1–5 oracle as “all humanity.”³⁹

For discussion of Early Jewish missionary efforts, see a devoted study to the topic in Michael F Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010).

37 Adalbert Merx, *Die Prophetie Des Joel und Ihre Ausleger von Den Alten Zeiten Bis zu Den Reformatoren* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1879), 21.

38 Cf. e.g., Crenshaw, *Joel*, 165; van de Sandt, “The Fate,” 57; Simkins, *Yahweh’s Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel*, 212. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 67.

39 Barton’s (*Joel and Obadiah*, 96.) evidence comes via Hulst (“Kol Basar in der Priesterlichen Fluterzählung,” in *Studies on the Book of Genesis*, vol. 12, OTS [Leiden: Brill, 1958], 28–66.) forty or so occurrences of the phrase [‘all flesh’] ... the main difference in meaning from one to another is in fact between ‘all human beings’ (e.g., Jer. 45:5) and ‘all living beings’ (e.g., Gen 7:16). There seems to be no other places where the meaning is clearly ‘all Israelites.’

Barton’s comments are about the Hebrew phrase כל בשר that πασαν σάρκα translates. But his, and Hulst’s, observations appear valid when applied to LXX-Joel. In the Book-of-the-Twelve, the only other occurrence of כל בשר is translated in LXX-Zech. 2:17 as πασα σαρξ. Outside of the LXX-Book-of-the-Twelve, the translation of the same Hebrew phrase can be equally, or more explicitly universal, cf. e.g. LXX-Is 40:5; Ez. 21:4, πασα σαρξ; LXX-Jer. 32:27, πάσης σαρκός; LXX-Jer. 45:5, πασαν σάρκα; and a more peculiar example of amplified translation in Is. 66:16, πασα ἡ γῆ ... πασα σαρξ. Additionally, in order to represent Barton’s views fairly, “oracles” is intentionally used to describe certain prophetic pericopes in Joel when discussing Barton, since according to Barton’s method of interpreting the prophet, he has chosen to view everything following 3:1 (= 2:28) as “a collection of miscellaneous oracles ...” (*Joel and Obadiah*, 65, emphasis mine). I do not share Barton’s view, but I do agree that a method like this “leave[s] much to be desired” (cf. Crenshaw, *Joel*, 164). Close to Barton and Hulst is Crenshaw (*Joel*, 165) who calls “all flesh” “inclusive” in its context.

So for Barton and Hulst, the phrase "all flesh" is not a matter of the choice between either "all Israel (or Judah)" or "all humanity," but rather a choice between either *all* of God's creatures or just his human creatures. Barton, therefore, concludes that this possibly makes Joel 3:1–5 "one of the most 'universalistic' in the Old Testament ..." ⁴⁰ Barton further suggests that Joel's universalistic message is "consistent with later rabbinic eschatology." ⁴¹ However, this is not substantiated with any clear evidence. If Barton's former conclusions are correct, this also means that the inspiration of "all flesh" would be available to all humanity, which places Joel's prophecy in a unique category in Jewish Scriptures.

Additionally, Barton challenges the certainty one can have that the identity of "Judah" and "Israel" remains fixed in Joel 4, which is a similar eschatological context that follows 3:1–5. For Barton, in the earlier oracles in Joel, Israel is to be taken at face value, and the Lord is "unequivocally pro-Israel and opposed to foreign nations." ⁴² However, with such particularism appearing to be suspended in the oracle of 3:1–5, Barton suggests that the ecclesiological landscape could have changed. He proposes that those called into the final eschatological battle against the Lord in 3:14–15,

Maybe the foreign nations of the previous oracle, but they might also be Israelites/Judeans or, for that matter, angelic beings ... This is a highly derivative oracle that tells us very little. ⁴³

Others have agreed that any ecclesiological statements made by the prophet after 3:1 are somewhat opaque. ⁴⁴

A parallel prophecy to Joel 3:1–5 may shed light on the universality in Joel. Micah 4:1–4 is a text that shares a considerable amount of similarity with Joel 3:1–5 and is set in a similar eschatological context. ⁴⁵ In Micah, the Lord is said to be manifest in a future day (4:1) on top of the "mountain of the Lord" (4:1, 2). For Micah's prophecy, like Joel's, Jerusalem and Israel ("Jacob," 4:2) take center stage as the Lord's place of eschatological operation and his people.

⁴⁰ Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 96.

⁴¹ Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 96.

⁴² Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 105.

⁴³ Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 105.

⁴⁴ Brawley (*Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995], 88), similar to Barton, calls the Valley of Decision "elusive."

⁴⁵ Jones, *Formation*, 210.

However, an active motif of universalism is present and more explicit than “all flesh” in Joel 3:1.⁴⁶

Similarly to those of Joel, Micah’s universalistic themes are followed by an apocalyptic war with strikingly similar language to Joel 4 (esp. 4:10; cf. Micah 4:3). In Micah 4:3, however, plowshares are not made into swords but the other way around. The time of peace in Micah 4:3–4 is a peace among nations, an eschatological peace promised in Joel 4:17–21, including similar vine imagery that describes the fruitfulness of this future era (cf. Micah 4:4, ἀμπέλου; Joel 4:18, γλυκασμόν). Micah shares a similar vision of a future era with Joel. Their shared tradition may shed light on Joel’s more elusive universal statements. But in the end, Joel (esp. 3:1–5) remains too opaque to firmly call him either nationalistically elite or universalistic in his scope. The burden of his message remains upon the response of those under the signs of the day and their response to the Lord’s offer of shelter and salvation.

On that day, the Lord’s presence is defined by many signs, and the inspiration of his Spirit is possibly unmatched since Eden. But for what purpose? The passage suggests the salvation for those who would escape to his presence.

In the setting of the day of the Lord, with its universally applied signs on the earth and in heaven, one could believe that this passage is about judgment. However, judgment is not mentioned in this passage though may be implied by that which is “escaped.” Judgment is the burden of the chapter to follow, namely, the battle in the Valley of Decision.⁴⁷ The emphasis of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is upon what the Lord is doing to save those who call upon his name.

There are two points of emphasis in 3:1–5 that work to make the same salvific point, namely, escaping and surviving. First, are those who are escaping from Mount Zion and Jerusalem? Joel cryptically says that this is “as the Lord has said.” Some believe that Joel depends on Obadiah 17–18, which is nearly identical to Joel.⁴⁸ Crenshaw also supposes that Joel may be referring back to 2:27, where the Lord promises that “my people shall never be put to shame.”⁴⁹ Both seem like possible solutions. But if Ob. 17–18 is Joel’s source, then Joel has intentionally altered the words of Obadiah to make the Lord’s protection and salvation more universal, more than in Obadiah’s focus solely on

46 Micah 4:2 says,

“and many nations shall come and say: ‘Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and they will show us his way, and we will walk in his paths.’”

47 Cf. Crenshaw, *Joel*, 165.

48 Cf. e.g., Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 175–76; Crenshaw, *Joel*, 169–70.

49 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 170.

Mount Zion.⁵⁰ For Joel, there is a possibility for those to be saved who are in Jerusalem and Mount Zion and outside those cities, which is consistent with 3:3–4 that describe universally observed signs in the heavens and on earth. It is as Crenshaw says: "The portents will not jeopardize anyone who acknowledges God's sovereignty."⁵¹

Second, those who survive (who are presumably *the same* as those who escape) are those who "call upon the name of the Lord." To call upon the Lord's name is the highest appeal one could make for the prophet and comes across as an exchange between the escapee and the divine: my full allegiance for your full salvation.

The phrase "call upon the name" held great significance in many cultural settings, including the Israelite one. To "call upon the name" might have been used to call upon divine heroes (e.g., Philost. *Hrk.* 31.7; 53.6, 11, 16) or even divine kings (Jdt 3:8).⁵² In Jewish texts it was used in reference to praying to the Lord (cf. e.g., Gen. 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; LXX-Ps. 78:6; 98:6; *Let. Aris.* 22.6; *Gen Rab.* 39:16; *Test. Mos.* 1:18).⁵³ For Joel, there is an evident emphasis. It is only upon the Lord's name that one can stake their salvation. Additionally, some have suggested that God's name can be associated with his literal presence.⁵⁴ Of course, this is completely in line with what Joel 3:1–5 says about the Lord in this Day.

The way this call is expressed in LXX-Joel 3:5, however, differs from what is found in the MT-Joel 3:5. According to the MT, those who are called by the Lord and escape are "among the survivors" (וְבַשְּׂרִידִים). But LXX-Joel appears to read וְבַשְּׂרִידִים as the verb בָּשַׂר, which would make the preposition ב part of the verb root. This means that LXX-Joel reads the Hebrew verb as a participle (piel) to mean "bear good tidings" (εὐαγγελίζονται).

The decision of LXX-Joel to read the Hebrew this way is best understood as underscoring the Lord's sovereign reign. More broadly than LXX-Joel, R. T. France notes that in the Psalms and prophets, more broadly than in LXX-Joel, the verb εὐαγγελίζω is used in a religious and regal context, connected to God's reign (cf. Ps. 40:9; 96:2; Is. 40:9; 52:7; 61:1), and that in the Hellenistic

50 Cf. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 176.

51 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 171.

52 Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 920 n642.

53 Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, 920.

54 Cf. Richard N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* [London: SCM, 1970], 41–45. Longenecker cites as proof, Deut. 12:11, 21; 14:23–24; 16:2, 11; 26:2; Neh 1:9; Ps. 74:7; Is. 18:7; Jer. 3:17; 7:10–14, 30). He also suggests that other pre-Christian (presumably Jewish) sources use "name" as a "quasi-hypostatic" form of revelation (*Christology*, 42). This use of name is also very similar to how Joel foresees a time of universal inspiration.

period its noun form, εὐαγγέλιον, was used in the context of the emperor cult and the proclamation of his birthday, inauguration or “royal visit.”⁵⁵ According to the salvific emphasis that is sensed in LXX-Joel 3, it is important to note that the Lord uses his regal sovereignty to announce good news to those who are escaping a horrifying situation.⁵⁶ Similarly, in the broader prophetic tradition, εὐαγγελίζω is often used in the exilic setting for announcing the advent of salvation from God (e.g., Na 2:1; Is 40:9[×2]; 52:7[×2]) and elsewhere for the announcement of salvation by the Messianic servant (Is. 61:1). LXX-Joel seems to tone down the feeling of judgment in the day of the Lord and emphasizes a Lord who seeks out all who will look to him from the signs of the day while he is present for salvation.

What emerges from LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is a vivid picture of the Lord’s active presence accompanied by the outpouring of his Spirit in an awaited future age. For Joel, the presence of the Lord is not to judge a universal audience, though judgment could be deduced for those who do not escape. But rather, the Lord’s presence is active in giving his people direct revelation of whom he is and issuing a call to survival or salvation to anyone who will call upon his name. Only by calling upon his name and on no other divine king or hero will one experience salvation from the imminent signs of the last days.

III LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2: God’s Attestation of the Lord and His Witnesses

The Lukan account of Pentecost begins in Acts 2:1. A verse later in 2:2, his account of supernatural signs of the first Christian Pentecost begins. The governing question for the day described by Luke is a corporate one asked by a gathered crowd from the Diaspora for the Jewish feast. Upon seeing the signs of Pentecost, collectively, they ask, “What does this mean?” (τί θέλει τοῦτο εἶναι).

Of the two answers offered to the crowd, the Lukan Peter’s answer is the second. The first is simply a jesting response that the men speaking in various foreign tongues are drunk (γλεῦκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσίν, 2:13).⁵⁷ Peter’s strong

55 R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids; Carlisle: Eerdmans; Paternoster, 2002), 52. Cf. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 69.

56 If one takes the address of salvation in LXX-Joel 3:1–5 to be a universal one, which seems to be what LXX-Joel may likely be intimating, then the application of εὐαγγελίζω would be contrary to the supposition of van de Sandt (“The Fate,” *passim*, esp. 67).

57 More attention will be given to the universal implications of tongues below, but for more on the cross-cultural and international implications of tongues see Craig S. Keener, “Why Does Luke Use Tongues as a Sign of the Spirit’s Empowerment?” *JPT* 15, no. 2 (2007):

negation of that first semi-serious offer introduces his speech (cf. οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε οὗτοι μεθύουσιν, 2:15).⁵⁸ He suggests that the ecstatic behavior in which the crowd witnesses is a sign of something greater, namely, the day of the Lord. These events, the Lukan Peter says, are those which the prophet Joel foresaw.⁵⁹

For his case for the lordship of Jesus, Luke appropriates LXX-Joel 3:1–5 with some changes. First, the Lukan quotation is exceptionally long, one of the longest in Acts.⁶⁰ Moreover, second, the quotation contains some significant additions and alterations and some additional minor ones that clue the student of Acts into the Lukan hermeneutic. The minor changes will be covered below.

At the beginning of the quotation, however, Luke makes probably the most significant amendment to LXX-Joel 3:1 and reveals most clearly what he believes about the quotations. The phrase Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα in LXX-Joel 3:1 becomes ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, which, for the Lukan Peter, means that the "last days" have come since that which was anticipated in Joel is now happening in Peter's own context.⁶¹

Some manuscripts, including B and 076, suggest a similar futuristic reading to LXX-Joel, but this simply appears to be an attempt to harmonize the quotation in Acts 2 with LXX-Joel (i.e. μετὰ ταῦτα).⁶² Also, there have been theological proposals that have attempted to undermine the Lukan appropriation

177–84. Cf. also, Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 211; Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996), 17–18.

58 Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 69.

59 Some have identified the Lukan Peter's connection between the Pentecost events and the Joel prophecy as an example of "this is that" pesher interpretation (cf. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, eds., *English Translation and Commentary, The Acts of the Apostles* [London: Macmillan, 1933], 22); Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 181; Litwak, *Echoes*, 156). However, Hays and others have cautioned the historical and methodological soundness of this supposition (Cf. *Echoes*, 10–14, 160–64, 180–82; Watson, *Paul*, 515). Bock (*Acts* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 111–12) has rightly said that Peter's connection is "similar to what one sees in pesher style interpretations found at Qumran." Italics mine.

60 Steyn, *Quotations*, 72. Steyn notes Bauernfield's rather outrageous claim that an explanation for such a full citation of Joel may be due to its pre-Lukan use for warding off drunkenness. Steyn, and others, reject this explanation, rightly (e.g., Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas*, 45–46).

61 Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 86. Steyn rightly suggests that this is an intentional change of the author, and not a "change due to [his text] Vorlage ..."

62 Concerning the B and 076, Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: UBS, 1971), 295, has demonstrated that the change to μετὰ ταῦτα is by the hand of an Alexandrian corrector who was motivated by the desire to bring Acts 2:17a back into conformity with LXX-Joel 3:1. Cf. also, C. K. Barrett, *Acts: 1–14* (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004), 136.

of LXX-Joel 3:1 saying, it is inconsistent with Lukan eschatology.⁶³ However, both challenges to ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις have been challenged. The phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is typical of Luke and the LXX corpus, which is significant in light of the general consensus of the familiarity that Luke appears to have with the Greek Scriptures (cf. e.g., LXX-Joel 1:2), and is significant proof for its originality.⁶⁴

The change by the Lukan Peter to ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις contemporized the quotation in the style of eschatological expectation.⁶⁵ Luke begins to answer the governing question, “What does this mean?” with this phrase that effectively turns a significant page in God’s redemptive-historical plan. Barrett says this phrase “points to the last act of history and claims [Peter and his audience] are part of God’s final act of redemption.”⁶⁶ Additionally, Steyn deftly shows that Peter’s strong negation of the drunkenness proposal is answered with a positive statement (i.e. ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον) that is contrary to such a superficial suggestion. He says,

Presented in this manner, the indication is clear: something that was already foretold by the prophet ..., presented as divine words of God, is happening at this moment (τοῦτό ἐστιν), i.e., and old prophecy is being fulfilled here.⁶⁷

But the question remains: Why does Luke feel this time has arrived? And what is it about the LXX-Joel 3:1–5 text that clarifies his belief of this fulfilled time, and how is this substantiated or proven?

63 Haenchen is the most notable opponent of seeing, specifically, Acts 2 as the last days (cf. “Schriftzitate Und Textüberlieferung in Der Apostelgeschichte,” 162). But Mussner has shown that neither μετὰ ταῦτα nor ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις can be seen as more Lukan in its eschatology, since the broader context has demonstrated that Luke is referring to the last days even before Peter’s quotation of Joel (“In Den Letzten Tagen [Apg 2:17a],” *BZ* 5, no. 2 [1961]: 263–65; cf. also, Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 161).

64 Cf. e.g., Steyn, *Quotations*, 87; Richard, “Creative Use,” 52–53. Additionally, for ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, some have suggested that Luke may have been amalgamating LXX-Is. 2:2 with LXX-Joel 3:1 (cf. William Kemp Clarke, “The Use of the Septuagint in Acts,” in *The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 2: Prolegomena II/Criticism*, eds. Lowther, F.J. Foakes, and Kirsopp Lake [London: Macmillan, 1922], 93–94), but verbally LXX-Joel is the better choice, and such a nuanced intertextual explanation is unnecessary (with Steyn, *Quotations*, 87–88).

65 Steyn, *Quotations*, 88; Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 161; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 252, 261; Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 136.

66 Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 136. Also, Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 252, 261.

67 Steyn, *Quotations*, 70. Cf. also, Brawley, *Text to Text*, 78–83. Steyn’s explanation confounds other proposals that this quotation is simply being used with hermeneutical purpose, as Litwak (*Echoes*, 156) would have it.

The importance of this initial alteration of the LXX-Joel quotation goes hand-in-hand with our proposal for how Luke appropriates LXX-Joel and why he feels the time has arrived, of which LXX-Joel 3 foretells. It hinges on God's singular action through Jesus that all are made witness to Jesus' ascension to lordship beginning at Pentecost and become prophets of this new reality when they confess it by repentance.

The way in which Luke brings LXX-Joel 3:1–5 to contemporary relevance in Acts 2 at Pentecost, with messianic themes that seem foreign to a natural reading to the text, has been called "revisionary" by Kenneth Litwak who also rejects claims that Luke is attempting to "fulfill" or "prove" anything or serve to demonstrate the fulfillment of anything by the appropriation of this text.⁶⁸ These issues will be at the heart of this section wherein the conclusion, Litwak's claims will be assessed more fully once Luke's appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 can be seen against the hermeneutical background made up of his two interlocutors—namely, the normative text of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and *The Testament of Judah* chapter 24 which similarly contemporizes the same text for purposes specific for its day.

III.a *The Case of Three Witnesses*

Next, we will look at the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 wherein three witnesses are called to clarify and prove his case that Jesus is the Lord of the "last days" spoken of by Joel.⁶⁹ These witnesses have prophetic roles for Luke. There is also a final role player in Acts 2, which is Joel as a fourth witness/prophet, of course, since it is the day he foretells. But it is the appropriation of this text that we are investigating, and it is this text that Luke believes to be fulfilled. For Luke, Joel is certainly a prophetic witness to this day of fulfillment, but for us at this point in this study to say the same may open us up to the charge of begging the question. Therefore, Joel will stand outside of this "line-up" of prophetic witnesses for now.

68 Cf. Litwak, *Echoes*, 155–57.

69 It cannot be forgotten, as it often seems to be by interpreters of Luke-Acts, that Luke is *making a case for something* (cf. Lk. 1:1–4; Acts 1:1–3). At the beginning of both works, Luke emphasizes that he is writing so that his reader may have certainty (τὴν ἀσφάλειαν) that what is said about Jesus is true (Cf. Lk. 1:1), and he does this by sources which included eyewitnesses and ministers of [God's] word (αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, Lk. 1:2). While Acts 2, and the book as a whole, places much emphasis on the Holy Spirit, one should ask why it does so. Though it will be covered more fully below, the Holy Spirit for Luke brings certainty of the reign of Jesus, in sum, by virtue of its confirmation of Jesus' ascension, cf. Acts 1:1; see Franklin, "Ascension".

For Luke, the three witnesses are as follows: (1) the signs of Jesus' self-aware prophetic identity alluding back to Jesus' ministry according to Luke's gospel (Acts 2:22–23);⁷⁰ (2) the prophetic foreknowledge of David (2:24–36); and (3) the prophetic role the crowd plays as a corporate interlocutor with the Lukan Peter by earlier asking "What does this mean?" (2:12), and then in response to Peter's explanation, they ask, "What shall we do?" indicating that they play an important role as witnesses to the meaning of the Pentecost events and the fulfillment of Joel by Jesus' lordship. By their repentance, the audience (2:37–41) publicly confesses the truth, and give witness to this by agreeing with what the Lukan Peter says is fulfilled by their shared context according to Joel (LXX-3:1–5) as we will see more fully below (cf. esp. 2:18, ἐκχεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεῖσουσιν). For Luke, the witness to God's attestation of Jesus' lordship moves chronologically according to God's work; from Jesus' ministry and death in Luke's gospel, to the resurrection and ascension according to David's covenantal prophecy, and then to the witness of the crowd to the outpouring of the Spirit verifying all of the above including Jesus' lordship.

Likely, Peter's contemporized reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is in order to show that what the Lukan Jesus predicted in Acts 1:8 is now occurring, namely, "you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth" (cf. Lk. 24:48–49). The "you" becomes a universal "you" that includes all whom the Spirit falls on and who repent. That is, the lordship of Jesus is universal and will have astounding universal implications that not even Peter could have foreseen, despite his words in 2:39. The crowds at Pentecost have now been made aware, by the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, of a new reality that integrally marks their context; namely, Jesus as universal Lord.

The case presented below is that the Lukan Peter utilizes LXX-Joel 3:1–5 to make the case that all have become prophets by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit for the expressed purpose of witnessing in truth to God's work in Jesus' ministry, death, resurrection, and ascension and his attestation of Jesus' lordship in the day of the Lord. All of this is evidenced by the appearance of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in each of the witnesses Luke calls, including the presently listening crowd.

Our proposal takes the unity of the Petrine speech seriously, since at each stage of the speech Luke is enlisting another prophet as a witness in order to make a case for Jesus' lordship. As such, we challenge the supposition that most commonly view the portion on the resurrection and the Psalms as another

⁷⁰ Cf. Turner, *Power*, 273; Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas*, 54.

"real difference in subject," as Lindars has suggested⁷¹ or as merely a Jewish commentary.⁷² Instead, this portion is an integral witness in the Lukan case and his appropriation and exposition of LXX-Joel 3:1–5.

III.b *Lukan Amendments to LXX-Joel 3:1–5*

Specifically, the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is marked by eight additions, one substitution, and one alteration. These will not all be covered in this section since many are nominal in their importance⁷³ and have been covered sufficiently by other studies.⁷⁴ However, three of the additions, beyond the one already covered in 2:17a, will take center stage in our investigation of how Luke intended his appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 to be understood given his use of witnesses to his case. These include:

(1) λέγει ὁ θεός (2:17) which reveals the Lukan emphasis throughout the rest of the speech, namely that God is the one who initiates, acts, attests, verifies, and is the subject.⁷⁵ For Luke, what is happening at Pentecost must not be seen as from human origins or human imagination. God is the essential aspect of each step in the Lukan case for Jesus' lordship, being the subject and primary

71 Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic. The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 37. Lindars says,

"The first thing to notice is that we can distinguish altogether between the first and second parts of the speech. In Acts 2.22 there is a new start. It is an appeal to the hearers, superficially similar to that made in v. 29. But in fact it bears no relation to the preceding quotation from Joel, whereas v. 29 begins the exposition of Psalm 16. This clean break is accompanied by a real difference of subject."

He continues,

"His sources may just as well have been two different ranges of scriptural material, *Joel 2.28–32 and its commentary*, and *Ps. 16.8–11 and its commentary*. We have to imagine something like the commentaries discovered at Qumran, consisting of text and comment after each verse, or group of verses."

72 Cf. van de Sandt, "The Fate," 56, with E. E. Ellis, "Midraschartige Züge in Den Reden der Apostelgeschichte," *ZNW* 62, no. 1–2 (1971): 99–101.

73 This is slightly contrary to Dodd's overly-general observation that "the author of Acts followed the LXX as we have it in the MSS., with a few not very important variations." (*According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* [London: Nisbet, 1952], 47; cf. also Steyn, *Quotations*, 79–81; Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones").

74 Cf. e.g., Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas*, 46–55; Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 157–67; Steyn, *Quotations*, 77–88.

75 Cf. e.g., Steyn, *Quotations*, 91, 101; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, The Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 36; Brawley, *Text to Text*, 83; Beverly Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 76–77.

actor.⁷⁶ It should be noticed that this addition is a Lukan way to differentiate God from the Lord since it is God's testimony that verifies Jesus' lordship in the end, for Luke.⁷⁷

(2) *καὶ προφητεύουσιν* (2:18) is an addition and, in fact, a repetition. In 2:17, *καὶ προφητεύουσιν* is retained from LXX-Joel 3:1, but Luke here repeats the verb to show the relations of the Spirit of the Lord to these people. These people, as Bock says, are "Spirit-endowed people [and] are prophetic."⁷⁸ And the associated minor addition to LXX-Joel 3:2 is two cases of *μου*, to emphasize the prophetic actions of these people as part of God's sole initiative;⁷⁹ i.e., "my male servants and my female servants ... shall prophesy" (i.e., *οὓς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ... προφητεύουσιν*).

(3) *σημεῖα* is a Lukan addition that becomes, for him, the way one witnesses God's actions. The use of *σημεῖα* directly links 2:22 to the quotation,⁸⁰ but is also in reference to the signs observed by the Lukan audience at Pentecost. These are the same wonders and signs used to demonstrate the identity of Jesus in Luke's gospel (cf. e.g., Lk. 10:13; 19:37) and for the Apostles throughout Acts (cf. e.g., 2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 7:36; 14:3, 15:2). The wonders are said to happen *ἄνω* and the signs *κάτω*; the locations of the "wonders and signs according to Acts 2:19 are, themselves, Lukan adjustments to Joel.⁸¹ Bock is correct, on the whole, concerning the addition of *ἄνω ... σημεῖα ... κάτω*, *pace* Rese's attempt to explain *σημεῖα* as a literary tie to 2:22 and as part of the integral part of the earth as the location of eschatological acts,⁸² that these words are basically redundant, and it is hard to make them theologically important, but there obviously seems to be some intention behind their ambiguous presence.⁸³ It seems best to believe that *σημεῖα* was added to accord with the normal Lukan use of the phrase *τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα*, and *ἄνω ... κάτω* appear to be emphasis to what Joel is already saying.

76 Turner, *Power*, 270.

77 Steyn, *Quotations*, 78. Steyn rightly sees *λέγει ὁ θεός* as a Lukan addition, and refuses the reading of D that would replace *θεός* with *κύριος* according to *lectio difficilior* (with Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas*, 48), as well as, he supposes, the broader knowledge of the Joel context by Luke.

78 Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 159.

79 For more discussion concerning the twice-occurring alteration of *ὑμῶν* to *μου*, see Steyn, *Quotations*, 81–82; Turner, *Power*, 270.

80 Turner, *Power*, 270.

81 See Steyn, *Quotations*, 83–84.

82 Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas*, 52–53.

83 Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 163.

Finally, the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 includes an allusion to Joel 3:5d later in Acts 2.⁸⁴ This allusion is found at the end of the Petrine speech in Acts 2:39. Below, it is suggested that this allusion functions to bracket the case Luke has made for the lordship of Jesus by the witnesses called to tell of the signs and actions of God that collectively point to his reign in the day of the Lord. The utilization of Joel 3:5d in this way works with the larger portion of the quotation in Acts 2:17–21 to emphasize what was not immediately evident in LXX-Joel 3:1–5, namely, the lordship of Jesus and its ongoing implications (i.e. "all those who are far off;" 2:39; cf. 1:8, "to the ends of the earth").

III.C *Luke's Case for Jesus as Lord of the Day of the Lord by Three Witnesses*

The Lukan Peter's choice to use such an extended quotation from LXX-Joel to throw light on the hysteria surrounding Pentecost is unique in its length but also in how little it potentially explains to the student of Acts. In looking to his speech as a unified whole, it is crucial to uncover why he believes LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is the best text to explain the meaning of the commotion in Jerusalem. As noted, three significant characters come on the scene for Luke that aid his case that the commotion is the sign of the day of the Lord, and that Jesus has ascended to the position of Lord as foretold in Joel. We will explore those witnesses now in order to understand how they support Luke's case, beginning with Jesus as a self-aware prophet and witness to his own identity. We will proceed also to ask what David as prophet and the crowd's role says about the use of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2 and its programmatic use for the rest of Acts.

III.C.1 Jesus as Self-aware Prophet in Luke's Gospel: the First Witness Acts 2:22–23

The first witness called for the Lukan case for Jesus' lordship is the ministry of Jesus as recounted in his gospel. Chronologically, it makes sense for Luke to start here. The importance of this witness to Luke's case but the brevity of the allusion to Jesus' ministry (only two verses, in comparison to a five-verse scriptural quotation and a twenty-six verse summary of a longer speech, cf. 2:40) only serve to emphasize the importance that one is familiar with the accounts of Jesus in what we now know as "The Gospel of Luke." (It certainly may be the case that Peter had said more in his original Pentecost speech since the audience would not have had the Lukan gospel to refer to. But it seems self-evident that whomever Luke was writing Acts for would have known of his accounts in his gospel. Cf. Acts 1:1–2)

84 Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*, 47.

The Lukan Peter makes a rather cryptic remark, “as you yourselves know.”⁸⁵ Most commentators believe this to be a case where Peter assumes that at least some of the Jerusalemites had heard of Jesus’ ministry, miracles, and death and that this was a rhetorical technique.⁸⁶ This is certainly a possibility, and it has been the stance broadly of C. Gempf,⁸⁷ Jervell, Schnabel, and, more recently, by Stenschke.⁸⁸ Jervell has said that Acts generally assumes that the life of Jesus was known by the people of God⁸⁹ since, as Schnabel has added, Jesus’ ministry was in the public eye in Israel.⁹⁰ Additionally, it is also likely that since it is evident Luke composes Peter’s speech to fit his narrative (cf. 2:40), and the accounts of Acts are said to rely on Luke’s gospel (1:1–5), Luke is merely adding an editorial comment that points his reader back to his previous work to pick up important details that he only alludes to here to save space.⁹¹ But if the whole

85 For more on what was expected from the Jewish audience receiving the speech of the Lukan James, see Christoph Stenschke, “The Jewish Saviour for Israel in the Missionary Speeches of Acts,” in *The Earliest Perceptions of Jesus in Context*, ed. Aaron W. White and Craig A. Evans, David Wenham (New York: Bloomsbury, 2018), 148–62.

86 Cf. e.g., Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 255; Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, 925. See Keener (925) on the practice of referring to a crowd as a rhetorical technique (he cites as proof, Acts 10:37; 20:18, 34; 26:26). The problem with this stance is that the commentators say that “some” of the crowd may be aware of Jesus’ ministry and death, but Peter says “you, yourselves.” It may be, then, that Peter is actually saying “you don’t know, but you should know.” This would make sense of the fact that his audience is to a singular voice in conversation with Peter in 2:14, 2:22 (and later in 2:37–39). Another proposal is Johnson’s, who suggests Luke’s appeal to the crowd may be echoing Moses’ works among Israel (see Deut. 34:10; *The Acts of the Apostles* [Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992], 50).

87 Cf. Conrad H. Gempf, “Historical and Literary Appropriateness in the Mission Speeches of Paul in Acts” (UK: The University of Aberdeen, 1988).

88 Stenschke, “Jewish Saviour.”

89 Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 145.

90 David John Williams, *Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1990), 141.

91 The debate concerning how Luke reports the speeches in Acts, their accuracy, and their relationship with other speech-reporting practices in the ancient Greco-Roman world, is a long and complex one (and in fact one which can be seen as wrapped up in the problem of sources for Luke-Acts); see I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], 37–42, and Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971], 81–90). As Keener rightly points out, “the stark choice between claiming that the speeches were accurate and claiming that they were invented is a false dichotomy ...” Keener rightly says that there is a continuum of positions that exist on how Luke reports speeches. See Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, 309–19. It has been shown that Luke is composing the speeches from accurate reports of what was said on the day of that speech, and with intention, leaves on the cutting room floor that which is not germane to his cause (cf. Acts 2:40), cf. Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 41–42), and against those who tend to believe that the speeches were more likely the invention of the writer (Luke) himself (cf. e.g.,

of Peter's crowd was at least superficially aware of Jesus, or if Luke was sending his reader back to his written gospel, Luke makes a significant allusion, one that his audience is now accounting for and witnessing in the development of the narrative taking shape. In the end, however, this witness, since it is written about more fully elsewhere, can afford to be made brief as being the first chronological witness to Jesus' lordship. One calls this "the Lukan kerygmatic history ... in a nutshell."⁹²

It is not, however, the full kerygmatic history of Jesus that is the focus of the Lukan Peter. Instead, with an integral connection to the LXX-Joel quotation, the focus is God's divine authentication of Jesus' ministry.⁹³ Readdressing the crowd in 2:22, Peter reveals the hidden actor behind the day of the Lord those at Pentecost are now observing and of which they have been made compulsory participants.⁹⁴ The actor and subject is God. At the center of the story of Jesus in 2:22–23, his ministry, and death, is God's plan and foreknowledge (cf. προγνώσει, 2:23). Consistent with the rest of the Lukan understanding of God's providence, the life, ministry and death of Jesus is orchestrated by God.⁹⁵ For Luke, this is foundationally authenticating for Jesus' identity as more than "a man." Similar to 2:23, elsewhere in Acts, Luke uses similar προ-compounds and equivalent language to demonstrate divine attestation and authentication of events and emissaries (3:18; 7:52; 10:41, 42; cf. Lk. 22:22).⁹⁶ It is normal to see Luke connect wonders and signs with Jesus' actions and God's work in Jesus, works that God had planned out (cf. 2:23, ὠρισμένη βουλή καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ). As elsewhere in Luke-Acts, mighty works by Jesus (e.g., Lk. 5:26; 7:16; 9:43; 17:18; 18:43) or his apostles (e.g., 2:47; 3:8–10; 4:21) direct attention to the glory

Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, eds., *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, The Acts of the Apostles [London: Macmillan, 1933], 420–21). Many studies exist on this debate, but for a selection of further works to consult on the speeches in Acts, see Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, 258–319; Stenschke, "Jewish Saviour."; and book-length treatments on specific aspects of Lukan speeches by Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994]; Osvaldo Padilla, *The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography* (New York: Cambridge, 2008); and Luke Timothy Johnson, *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts* (Milwaukee: Marquette, 2002).

92 C. H. Cosgrove, "Divine DEI in Luke-Acts: Investigations Into the Lukan Understanding," *NovT* 26, no. 2 (1984): 184. Cf. also Kilgallen ("Unity of Peter's the Pentecost Speech," *BibTod* 82 [1976]: 650–56) who calls this "the story of Jesus."

93 Cosgrove, "Divine DEI," 184.

94 Tannehill, *Acts*, 36. Cf. also, Brawley, *Text to Text*, 83; Steyn, *Quotations*, 101.

95 Cosgrove, "Divine DEI," passim, esp. 184–89. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 255; Joseph A Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 219–21.

96 Cosgrove, "Divine DEI," 185.

of God and his plan.⁹⁷ The connection of God's attestation (cf. ἀποδειγμένον, 2:22) through these signs to those noted in LXX-Joel is intentional.⁹⁸ God authenticates the significance of "the man" (ἄνθρωπος), Jesus of Nazareth, as significant in his plan, and soon to be called "Lord."⁹⁹ God's "powerful deeds" (δυνάμεις) is here in 2:22–23 consistent with how Luke depicted the miracles that authenticated his ministry (cf. e.g., Lk 10:13; 19:37, also in connection to divine "authority," Lk. 4:14, 32, 36; 5:17, 24).¹⁰⁰ This is probably, for Luke, an intended allusion to what he had previously written.

Additionally, "wonders and signs" demonstrate Jesus' own self-awareness of his prophetic role in Luke's gospel and his role in God's plan, a day that Peter and his audience now inhabit. Peter associates in 2:22 the "wonders in the heavens ... and signs on earth" as the "wonders and signs" and the "mighty works" God did through Jesus that marked Jesus' ministry as one attested by God himself. Specifically, these words allude to a couple of key instances in Luke's gospel where Jesus' prophetic office takes center stage and gives the indication that he was aware of his role as prophet of God's redemptive-historical plan.

First, in reference to Jesus' prediction of the temple's destruction in Luke 21, the Lukan Jesus says, "And there will be signs in sun and moon and stars ..." (Lk. 21:25a). In addition to the close language association this makes to LXX-Joel 3:4 and its appropriation in Acts 2:22, Joel 2:10b sounds strikingly similar to this prediction, saying, "... the sun and the moon shall grow dark ...," the Lukan Jesus, probably pointing towards the day that is recorded at Pentecost, uses theophanic and 'day of the Lord' language that LXX-Joel uses to predict this Day. In some way, according to the Lukan Jesus, the temple will play a key role in this Day. Surely Luke is forecasting what becomes a greater theme in the polemic in Acts 7 and inclusion of the Gentiles in Acts 15; Acts 15 is probably an echo of LXX-Joel 4:21 (cf. LXX-Amos 9:11–12).¹⁰¹

Secondly, another allusion can be found to Jesus' "wonders and signs" at the scene of his death. The Lukan Peter does not say specifically that Jesus' death was one of God's authenticating wonders and signs in Jesus' ministry, but he did say that God was active in it. Luke 23 seems to say the same

97 Cosgrove, "Divine DEL," 188.

98 The language of τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα occurs many more times in Acts (cf. 2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 7:36; 14:3; 15:12), and is similar to the language used in the Greek Scriptures ("the LXX") in reference to God's mighty works (cf. e.g., Ex. 7:3; Deut. 4:34; 28:46; 29:2; 34:11; Ps. 135:9; Is. 8:18). Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 255.

99 Steyn, *Quotations*, 101.

100 Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 255. Cf. also, Joseph A Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 542–43, 581–82, 853.

101 Cf. Tannehill, *Acts*, 31–32.

thing. In Luke 23:44–45, Luke reports that at the sixth hour “there was darkness over the whole earth ... while the sun failed” (καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν γῆν ... τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος). In connection to the ambiguous Lukan addition to LXX-Joel 3:3 of ἄνω ... σημεῖα ... κάτω, the signs observed before Jesus’ death are those in heaven and on earth. Specifically, Luke 23:45 reports that the curtain of the temple was torn (ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον; Lk. 23:45).¹⁰² Much remains in question about what Luke is saying here when he alludes to the temple curtain, including if this was the inner or outer curtain of the temple and what the tearing could signify for Luke.¹⁰³ The best option in this debate is the one that connects what is above and below—namely, as Nolland suggests,

the rending of the temple veil [is] like the opening of heaven in 3:21 and the access to heaven granted to the vision of Stephen in Acts 7:55–56 ...¹⁰⁴

That is, the rending of the veil is significant since it demonstrates in Acts 2 a connection between the heavens above and the earth below, specifically in how God does not distinguish between the two in the day of the Lord. God’s activity in both realms confirms Jesus’ work as divine in origin.

Of course, a myriad of other signs and wonders are performed by Jesus according to God’s attestation to who he is. But the point of Acts 2:22–23 is, for Luke, to emphasize the importance of the witness and prophecy of Jesus to what is now occurring in Acts.¹⁰⁵ Most important is the fact that it is also Jesus’ death that should not be viewed as shameful, but as part of God’s authentication of his lordship. It was even according to God’s foreordination that Jesus was handed over to “lawless” men to be killed. In accordance to the Lukan belief that God is the primary actor, and in agreement with LXX-Joel that God is the sole player, even Jesus’ death was not of human origins. The Lukan gospel witnesses to this, and it leads to only something that God could do, namely, the bodily resurrection and ascension of Jesus, which leads Luke to his second prophetic witness.

¹⁰² Cf. Brawley, *Text to Text*, 88.

¹⁰³ For more discussion about the rending of the veil, and possible views on its meaning, cf. John Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20* (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 1156–58.

¹⁰⁴ Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 1157.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 101.

III.C.2 David and the Psalms: the Second Witness Acts 2:24–35

The second witness called in the Lukan case for the lordship of Jesus is David. Luke moves from God's active role in Jesus' death to God's active role in his resurrection and ascension to Lord. To make his case, he appeals to LXX-Ps. 15:8–11 and LXX-Ps. 109:1.¹⁰⁶

The function of these Psalms is as a prophecy. David takes on a prophetic office when the Psalms are quoted here (cf. προφήτης οὗν ὑπάρχων, 2:30). His appeal to David *as prophet* immediately differentiates itself from an appeal to David from that of the Lukan Paul in Acts 13:22¹⁰⁷ where David is placed among the Kings of Israel, and where it is said that "God had promised the fathers" (ὃν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην), not specifically David. This seems to be a further elaboration of what is implied in Lk 20:41–44.¹⁰⁸

David's prophetic role is one very rarely appealed to in the Hebrew Scriptures or early Jewish writing¹⁰⁹ and has only gained a nominal amount of attention in secondary sources.¹¹⁰ Compounding the issue for how one should understand David as a prophet is that the suggestions in the latter sources have spanned a broad spectrum. Some proposals regard the Lukan Peter's designation of David's prophetic role as a reflection of post-exilic theological development,¹¹¹ while others have suggested that David as a prophet should be a natural conclusion considering his role as Psalm writer inspired by the Holy Spirit.¹¹² Finally, a more significant majority has made the case that his faith in God's covenant promises made his foreknowledge prophetic.¹¹³

¹⁰⁶ For an analysis of the Lukan text source for the Pss. see, e.g., Steyn, *Quotations*, 103–10, 116–25. Gregory V. Trull, "Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16:8–11 in Acts 2:25–32," *BibSac* 161, no. 644 (2004): 434–35.

¹⁰⁷ Contra, Steyn, *Quotations*, 101.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 101.

¹⁰⁹ For discussion of these occurrences see, e.g., James L. Kugel, "David the Prophet," in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*, ed. James L. Kugel (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 45–50. Cf. Epistle of Barnabas 6.6.

¹¹⁰ This leads Kugel ("David the Prophet," 45) to rightly say that "David is the most unlikely candidate for the title of prophecy."

¹¹¹ Cf. Kugel, "David the Prophet."

¹¹² Cf. Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 76–77; Johnson, *Acts*, 51; Margaret Daly-Denton, "David the Psalmist, Inspired Prophet: Jewish Antecedents of a New Testament Datum," *ABR* 52 (2004): 32–45. Also see O'Toole ("Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost," *JBL* 102, no. 2 [1983]: 245) and Barrett ("Luke/Acts," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture Essays in Honour of Banabas Lindars, SSF*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 238) concerning Luke's belief that David was the author of the Psalter.

¹¹³ Cf. e.g., Robert F O'Toole, "Davidic Covenant"; Trull, "Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16"; Gregory V. Trull, "Views on Peter's Use of Psalm 16:8–11 in Acts 2:25–32," *BibSac* 161, no. 642

Each suggested view on this way of referring to King David as a prophet have their virtues and help to try to locate the identity of "David as a prophet" in the Lukan Peter's milieu. But the majority view that sees the Lukan Peter looking to David through the lens of covenant promise and covenant fulfillment is probably the best one since David's foreknowledge was informed by the assurance by God that he would have a reigning heir from his line (as seen it is interpreted through the lens of LXX-Ps. 15 and LXX-Ps. 109; esp. εἰδὼς ὅτι ὁρκῶ ὡμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς, 2:30).

Steyn calls the Lukan appeal to the Psalms in Acts 2:24–31 "the most comprehensive link between the resurrection of Jesus and Scripture." This may be true, but in addition, it may also be the most important connection to LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and the function of Joel's prophecy about the day of the Lord with reference to Jesus. It is the prophecy from the Psalms that leads Peter to declare to the crowd

Therefore, let all the house of Israel know for *certain* that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified (Acts 2:36, italics added)

No longer does only David see this day and its fulfillments, but the crowd as a whole does as well. They are a corporate prophetic witness to the inauguration of the day foretold in LXX-Joel 3, and therefore the lordship of Jesus by the reception of his outpoured Spirit. As with the preface to his gospel and Acts, certainty plays a prominent role and is the goal of his appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and of his use of witnesses to his case. The prophetic identity and certainty of what they see and hear claimed in verse 36 (of those upon whom the Spirit is poured out) are promised by the prophecy and reinforced by Luke with his repetition of προφητεύω in 2:18.

But before the crowd are seen as prophets, it is David's prophetic words that take center stage in the Lukan Peter's explanation of what is happening at Pentecost, making the connection between the Joel 3:1–5 prophecy and its prophetic emphasis (cf. Acts 2:17, 18). The importance of this stage of the Lukan argument in Peter's speech is that David is a prophet with the "Lord" clearly in his vision (cf. 2:25, προορώμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός; 2:34, εἶπεν [ὁ] κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου). Some emphasis, indeed, is put on "messiah" (cf. 2:31, 36; χριστός), but the context and the crowd's reaction in 2:37

(2004): 194–214; Andrew E. Steinmann, "What Did David Understand About the Promises in the Davidic Covenant?" *BibSac* 171, no. 681 (2014): 19–29.

seem to more naturally emphasize the word “Lord.”¹¹⁴ In both Psalms that are quoted in the Lukan Peter’s speech, the Lord is the main emphasis both in his resurrection (LXX-Psalm 15:10) and ascension (LXX-Psalm 109). Acts 2:36 states clearly Peter’s conclusions, which is that Jesus is the Lord prophesied in these Psalms (not David), and these Psalms are talking about the same Lord foretold by LXX-Joel 3:1–5. Jesus is the Lord that Joel saw on the day of the Lord. He can be this Lord because he is not dead but alive and ascended according to the prophetic visions David had of the Lord.

Peter’s first appeal to the LXX-Ps. is to LXX-Ps. 15:8–11 in reference to God’s resurrection of Jesus from the dead (Acts 2:24–32).¹¹⁵ The primary point that the Lukan Peter wants to be heard is that Jesus is bodily resurrected, not David (Acts 2:29) is bodily resurrected. This is not something that happens by Jesus’ power but by the power of the primary actor, God (2:24).¹¹⁶ By Jesus’ preservation from death and decay, he is enabled to take the throne of David and is the natural subject of the prophecy.

The connection between LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and LXX-Ps. 15:8–11 is the active presence of “the Lord” (cf. LXX-Ps. 15:8) and its connection to God’s work in Acts 2:24.¹¹⁷ The use of LXX-Ps. 15 as opposed to MT-Ps. 16, is, for some, to place emphasis on the bodily resurrection.¹¹⁸ But others have disagreed with this conclusion, holding that the Semitic text can conceptually convey the same point about bodily decay in Hades, though the Greek text may have solidified the concept through time.¹¹⁹ Either way, this seems to be unnecessarily parsing out what the context clarifies.¹²⁰ That is, the context of Lukan Peter’s argument

114 Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 127.

115 Much discussion has surrounded the appeal made to LXX-Ps. 15 by the Lukan Peter, especially concerning its hermeneutics. For a helpful discussion on these views, see Trull, “View on Peter’s Use”. A full exegesis of the use of LXX-Ps. 15:8–11 will not be pursued here, but for more on this see e.g., Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 171–81; Trull, “Peter’s Interpretation of Psalm 16,” 432–48.

116 Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 256; Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 143; Trull, “Peter’s Interpretation of Psalm 16,” 443.

117 Steyn, *Quotations*, 111.

118 Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 110. Trull, “Peter’s Interpretation of Psalm 16,” 446.

119 For more on this issue see, Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 175–76. Cf. And for further details on the Semitic text and its use in Jewish background see, Roland E. Murphy, “Sahat in the Qumran Literature,” *Bib* 39, no. 1 (1958): 61–66.

120 Additionally, the discussion of the Lukan “choice” of cognate texts seems methodologically misguided. It is generally agreed that Luke consistently defers to the Greek text as his text of choice (cf. van de Sandt, “The Fate,” 58; Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 166; or only available text, possibly), and differences between the Lukan rendering of the Greek vis-a-vis other Greek MSS or Hebrew MSS, generally speaking, are due not to a differing choice of Hebrew *Vorlage* or a convenient amalgamation of Hebrew and Greek readings, but Luke’s

makes this Ps. quotation about one thing, the bodily resurrection of Jesus that points to the ascension (cf. Lk. 24:36–43; 50–51; Acts 1:9).¹²¹

For Peter, LXX-Ps. 15:8–11 is a confirmation of his statement that "God raised [Jesus] up, loosing him from the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it" (Acts 2:24). Three points of certainty observable by his audience prove the prediction made in LXX-Ps. 15 for Peter. First, it was said by David the prophet. Peter's statement in 2:24 is connected to LXX-Ps. 15 by Δαυὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν.¹²² Later Peter equates this to a prophetic saying in 2:30. It is suggested by the use of these Psalms that David holds a prophetic role in Israel's history and Scriptures that points to a promised heir that would reign on his throne gave him the ability to foresee the preservation of Jesus in God's plan (cf. Ps. LXX-131:11).¹²³ By virtue of (1) David's covenant faithfulness known to the Jewish people, (2) of the fact that the Psalms credited to him, and (3) of a seemingly general awareness in some Jewish literature of his prophetic role (cf. e.g., 11QPs^a 27:2–11; *Jos Ant* 6.8.2 §16),¹²⁴ the Lukan Peter's appeal to David's prophetic office seems to be sufficient for his audience.

But it is two further points that make it more evident that David was foreseeing someone besides himself. The second of three points is that the audience's general knowledge of the extant grave of David makes it clear that LXX-Ps. 15 is not about David (Acts 2:29; cf. e.g., Neh. 3:16; Jos. *JW* 1.61; *Ant.* 13.249).¹²⁵ Third, there seems to be a corporate witness to Jesus' resurrection and ascension (cf. οὗ πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες, 2:32) which is a less extended witness than that to Jesus' ministry noted in 2:22 (hence, ἡμεῖς, probably referring to the apostles instead of the whole crowd [cf. ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἶδατε, 2:23], cf. Acts 1:8). Both supporting proofs point back to David, not as the one who embodies the Messiah and thus was also preserved,

active reading and appropriating of a normative scriptural text for his specific literary and historical context.

121 O'Toole ("Davidic Covenant," 253–54) suggests that the amount of time Luke spends on the Davidic promise, in reference to the resurrection, make this, for Luke, "the central Christian belief." It seems to depend on how one reads O'Toole to know if his proposal runs contrary to Franklin's emphasis on the ascension (cf. "Ascension").

122 See Trull ("Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16," 437–39) on the uniqueness of this phrase in the NT, which for Trull, points to the Messiah and not David as the exclusive referent in the Petrine use of LXX-Ps. 15.

123 Cf. Trull, "Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16," 444.

124 Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 258; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 131–32; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "David, 'Being Therefore a Prophet ...' (Acts 2:30)," in *CBQ* (1972), 332–39.

125 Cf. Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 180–81.

as Bock helpfully points out, but instead to David as a prophet and the veracity of his prophecy of the resurrection in LXX-Ps. 15.¹²⁶

The second Psalm quoted by the Lukan Peter to support the case he is making from LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is LXX-Ps. 109:1.¹²⁷ With a particular emphasis on Jesus' ascension to power (Acts 2:33–36). By making a final differentiation between David and Jesus in 2:34, the Lukan Peter further solidifies David's role as God's prophet and his prophetic witness to Jesus as Lord. He emphasizes that the Psalms did not prophesy about a Davidic ascension (οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, 2:34), but that David foresaw one who would be raised to God's right hand (cf. λέγει δὲ αὐτός, 2:34).

The supporting use of LXX-Ps. 109 functions to demonstrate that God has acted alone to fulfill the promise made to David.¹²⁸ The promise is fulfilled by the bodily ascension of Jesus to the right hand of God and is attested by the crowd through the outpouring of the Spirit. This is the climactic moment of the Lukan Peter's case for Jesus' lordship.¹²⁹ Jesus is enthroned as Lord with equal power and standing and offering the same life and salvation (cf. Ex. 15:6; LXX-Ps. 17:35; 25:10; 43:3; 47:10; 59:5; 97:1; 117:16; 137:7) as Yahweh of the Jewish Scriptures.¹³⁰ These two "prophecies" of David build Luke's case to a moment at which Jesus can be declared the awaited and anointed (hence, messiah) Lord of LXX-Joel 3:1–5.

This prophecy from LXX-Ps. 109, connects to LXX-Joel 3:1–5 by its emphasis on God's singular action, discussion of "the Lord" in reference to David's vision of Jesus' reign and power given by God, and prophecy, namely that of David, alluded to in the differentiation in 2:34. These aspects drawn from the LXX-Joel quotation connect the final part of the Davidic prophecy to Jesus' ascension to power. However, the Lukan Peter adds the important element of the Spirit as proof for the ascension that is otherwise invisible to the crowd.¹³¹ It is the

126 Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 180. Trull, "Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16," 447.

127 As with the Joel quotation and LXX-Ps. 15, Luke's text of choice for LXX-Ps. 109:1 is the Greek Scriptures closest to the A-group. Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 119, 120, 123.

128 Steyn (*Quotations*, 121), with O'Toole ("Davidic Covenant," 249), astutely calls David "the primary recipient of God's promise." This is a correct observation because in 2:39 the promise is not transferred to those who repent. Rather, they are beneficiaries of the "oath" given to David by virtue of repenting and being baptized into the people of God.

129 Gaventa, *Acts*, 79; Franklin, "Ascension," 192, 195, 200.

130 Cf. Turner, *Power*, 260, 278; Johnson, *Acts*, 52; Donald H. Juel, "Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2," *CBQ* 43, no. 4 (1981): 544; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 260; Steyn, *Quotations*, 123.

131 Similarly, Bock (*Proclamation*, 183) calls this

"an important theological key to both the use of Ps. 110 [LXX-Ps. 109] and to the use in Joel 3 of the name of the Lord as a reference to Jesus. The theological link is the concept of God sending the Spirit through Jesus who sits by him in heaven at his right hand."

poured-out Spirit from LXX-Joel 3:1–5 that connects the prophetic fulfillment of Jesus' resurrection to the fulfillment of his ascension. Jervell correctly says, "God has worked through the resurrection and exaltation. The outpouring of the Spirit demonstrates it."¹³² Additionally, Luke makes the case that the poured-out Spirit confirms God's fulfilled promise and Jesus as the mediator of that promise.¹³³ Taken together, this makes David's words prophetic when he is quoted from Psalm 15 and 109.¹³⁴

III.C.3 The Repentant Eschatological Prophets: the Final Witness

Acts 2:36–41

Reaching the pinnacle of his argument at the ascension and outpouring of the Spirit, the Lukan Peter's case for the sign of the ecstatic behavior beginning Acts 2 closes. He has answered the corporate question, "What does this mean?" For the Lukan Peter, those in the crowd are not witnesses to belligerence, but they are witnesses to the signs of the God-anointed enthronement of "Jesus of Nazareth" as Lord (ὁ ὑμεῖς [καὶ] βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε, 2:33, cf. 2:11–d12, 15). By appropriating the message of LXX-Joel 3:1–5, Peter says that we see the sign and wonders showing that we now stand in the day of the inauguration of the Lord Jesus' reign upon David's throne, a theme to be further developed throughout Acts, especially in Acts 13 (the location of our third LXX-TP quotation, LXX-Hab. 1:5). He suggests that the crowd can know this with certainty (cf. 2:36) through signs given by God (that Joel speaks of; cf. Acts 2:19–20) and by relating David's prophecy of "the Lord" to the man that the crowd should know as "a man ... Jesus of Nazareth."¹³⁵

For the Lukan Peter, 2:36 segues to a prompted response from the audience that is important to the final part of the appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5. Peter reveals the full force of his argument by indicating explicitly the full guilt of the crowd. It is not merely the "lawless men" noted in 2:23 that are guilty of killing the Lord Jesus; it is the crowd corporately that bears guilt, according to the Lukan Peter.¹³⁶ Peter's mounting case and explanation of the meaning of the signs that the crowd once, back in 2:12, asked to understand (those signs

¹³² Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 150. My translation. Cf. Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 181. Similarly, Steyn (*Quotations*, 116) says,

"The message [of Jesus ascension and pouring out of the Spirit] itself is divine, and could have been known only through God who has revealed it himself. The promise of the Holy Spirit (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου) was now received by the exalted Jesus at the right hand of God, transferred from the Father himself."

¹³³ Turner, *Power*, 278.

¹³⁴ Steyn, *Quotations*, 115; Gaventa, *Acts*, 79.

¹³⁵ Cf. Darrell L Bock, *Proclamation*, 181.

¹³⁶ Gaventa (*Acts*, 79) helpfully points out the intentional contrast between the crowd's guilt and God's actions, namely "God has made," versus "you crucified."

that the prophet Joel told of, cf. Acts 2:19–20), comes to a head when Peter declares the crowd, as one corporate entity, guilty.

The Lukan Peter's charge prompts the second corporate question, "Brothers, what shall we do?" in 2:37. To speak anachronistically, the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is supported by a structure that some modern Christian preachers call "what is true, and what to do."¹³⁷ That is, for Luke, the crowd is not simply an onlooker; it now has an ethical responsibility to respond to what it has seen and heard. According to the Joel prophecy, the crowd has become Spirit-borne prophets and according to 2:39, what it has seen will also reach those far off. It is plausible that the news would reach "those who are far off" by the agency of some or many of those present at Pentecost, judging by their reaction to Peter's explanation.

The final part of LXX-Joel 3:5 is quoted to finish the ethical paraenesis of Peter's speech. He says, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus ... For the promise is for you and for your children and for all who are far off, everyone whom the Lord calls to himself." The use of LXX-Joel 3:5d here is not a direct quotation but more precisely an allusion. However, the verbal similarity in Acts 2:38–40 to Joel 3:5d is striking.¹³⁸ Additionally, van de Sandt has found reason to trace the Lukan language in these verses to Is. 57:18–19. This feels like an unnecessary appeal to a context that is neither a strong enough connection to LXX-Joel 3, nor one to which Luke himself appeals. Others have also shown more convincingly language, such as "those who are far off" to be a more general Jewish literary motif and idiom for non-Israelite nations that Is. 57 itself employs (cf. also Eph. 2:13, 17).¹³⁹

As alluded to above, there is a double-pronged paraenesis being made by the Lukan Peter, both prongs relating to the promise made to David. The first is the call to salvation from judgment. The Lukan Peter says to "repent and be baptized" for the forgiveness of their sins—to "receive salvation." (cf. 2:38, 40). The use of baptism in the name of Jesus, the Lord, is a sign of protection. Jervell observes the implications of what Peter says, saying, "baptism in the name of Jesus is pronounced over the candidate for baptism, whereby the baptized is placed under his protection."¹⁴⁰ A similar anticipation of an eschatological age where water baptism and God's Spirit bring in a new era is seen in the prophets (cf. Ez. 36:25–26; Zech. 13:1–3) and some Qumran documents (e.g., 1QS 4.20–21)

137 For more on speeches in Acts as sermons cf., Aaron W. White, "The Apostolic Preaching of the Lord Jesus," *Presbyterion* 44, no. 2 (2018): 33–51.

138 Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 127.

139 Cf. e.g., J. A. Loader, "Explanation of the Term *Proselutos*," *NT* 15, no. 4 (1973): 277.

140 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 153. My translation.

and can be found in certain early Christian textual history (cf. $\aleph$ variant for John 3:8 that inserts τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ resulting in οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ [τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ] τοῦ πνεύματος).

Secondly, the most contextually important is that the crowd is a recipient of the benefits of the promise made to David foretold even as early as Lk 3:16 by the Baptist. God "made the oath" to David and gave the promise to Jesus for the crowd to receive. Salvation is available for all upon whom the Spirit falls in the day of the Lord Jesus since, as per the Lukan Peter, all are guilty of the death of Jesus. Salvation is offered to those who would find themselves in need of rescue from their revealed sin of killing God's attested Lord and Messiah. (It is interesting to note that Luke makes no mention of anyone in the crowd *not* repenting at the outpouring of the Spirit, but rather notes only a positive reception by the crowd. This is a similar situation to another important crowd response in Acts 13. The crowd receives a similar message from Paul and Barnabas in Pisidian Antioch with like enthusiasm in 13:42–43, but changes their tune the following week on realizing the implications of the message for Gentiles.)

But as per the LXX-Joel 3:5d allusion, those who make up the crowd are not the only ones in view for Luke. The promise of the Spirit and salvation is for "all who are far off," foreshadowing the universal reach of the salvation offered under Jesus' lordship here implied by Luke, though maybe not foreseen by Peter. Peter's knowledge of what will later transpire in Acts, of course, is limited, but the student of Acts knows with certainty that the Gentiles later receive this promise.¹⁴¹ Peter's limited knowledge and the temporary restriction of the gift of the Spirit to Israel does not restrict Luke from foreshadowing what he understands Joel 3:5d to say about the eschatological day of the Lord.¹⁴² Jesus' lordship has universal implications including salvation. Gaventa helpfully articulates the implicit universalism Luke is forecasting, saying,

[The promise] extends temporally to incorporate both those present and the generations that will follow, and it extends geographically to incorporate those who are "far away" ... the claim anticipates the extent of that promise to "the ends of the earth" (1:8).¹⁴³

141 Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 254; Johnson, *Acts*, 49; Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, 881–82; Gaventa, *Acts*, 80; Jervell, *Luke*, 42.

142 Cf. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, 881–82; Johnson, *Acts*, 49. Gaventa, *Acts*, 80; van de Sandt, "The Fate," 73.

143 Gaventa, *Acts*, 80. For more on the implied geography that Luke seeks to cover in his narrative of Acts, see James M. Scott, "Luke's Geographical Horizon," in *Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), passim, esp. 483. Even in his

For Luke, the future spread of the message will cover every inch of the geographical and ethnic landscape beginning in Jerusalem (cf. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, Lk. 24:47; ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ, Acts 1:8).¹⁴⁴

Also, the importance of the scope foreshadowed by the Lukan allusion to LXX-Joel 3:5d is that it is not simply the crowd at Pentecost but also a continually widening scope of people groups who become witnesses and prophets of God in fulfillment of 2:17–18. The Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and the case that Jesus is the Lord spoken of in this text has been carried by the witness of prophets and the crowd's witness to the signs that verify those prophetic utterances (i.e., tongues and the outpoured Spirit). The role of a prophet is no longer simply relegated to the exceptional, nor even to the apostles in the rest of Acts, but to all who have received the benefits of the promise made to David. Steyn says, “A new dispensation has come, where all will share in this gift, not only prophets, kings, or priests, (as during OT times), and ‘without distinction of age, sex, or social standing.’”¹⁴⁵ This is as Moses had once hoped in Numbers 11:19.

Similarly, Menzies says that these men were not inebriated; rather, “they are eschatological prophets proclaiming the word of God.”¹⁴⁶ What this means is that when the crowd, according to new revelation of the identity of Jesus confess the truth, they become “my [God's] servants who prophesy” (cf. τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ... προφητεύουσιν, 2:18), in fulfillment of Joel 3:1 and the Lukan adjustment of the LXX-Joel quotation in 2:18 which adds emphasis. The crowd is now identified as “one of the prophets” (again, a single corporate entity) of God for the purpose of Peter's argument by virtue of their reception of the Spirit (cf. ἐχχέω ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύουσιν, 2:18). Their words of repentance confirm the truth of the prophecy of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and what the outpouring of the Spirit indicates as fulfilled.

When the crowd asks, in effect, “What should we do now that we know?” Peter says they are to fulfill what Lk. 24:47–49 and Acts 1:8 said would happen when the Spirit would be poured out. He says in 2:36, ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω

gospel, Luke used people groups and geography to indicate the spread of a message to a region or people. Cf. e.g. Lk. 5:17, Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 234.

144 Concerning the grammatical change regarding the call of the Lord from οὗς κύριος προσκέκληται in LXX-Joel 3:5 to ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. Van de Sandt (“The Fate,” 73–74) errs in calling the Lukan rendering of the verb as future tense, which for Sandt means a trajectory of universalism beginning in Acts 8. Instead, Luke makes the indicative perfect from LXX-Joel 3:5 an aorist subjunctive in Acts 2:39, which for all intents and purposes makes the implications of the Lord's call more presently oriented instead of the prophet's future oriented grammar.

145 Steyn, *Quotations*, 95. With Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 73.

146 Menzies, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 221.

πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ. This phrase can be rendered "Let all the house of Israel know with certainty ..." He prophesies the lordship of Jesus, but the call is now for those who hear and perceive to do the same and give reason to believe, which intentionally echoes the purpose of Luke's double work (Lk. 1:1–4). Those of the "all flesh" upon whom which the Spirit of God has been poured out are now prophets of God according to the reign of Jesus and become part of God's prophetic tradition with the prophet Joel, Jesus, David, and the apostles. Acts now becomes the "Acts of the people of God under the lordship of Jesus of Nazareth," and the implications of this will unfold as the story moves forward.

III.d Summary

Luke has appropriated a large portion of Scripture in LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in order to make a case for the lordship of Jesus. In order to make clear that all signs point to the fulfillment of this Scripture, he calls four witnesses and four prophets. In addition to the prophetic witness of Joel, the self-aware prophecy of Jesus, and the prophecy of David rooted in covenantal faithfulness; the crowd finally becomes the fourth witness to the fulfillment of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and the fourth prophet to grasp the reality of the day of the Lord under Jesus' reign.

Accordingly, the way in which LXX-Joel 3:1–5 brackets Peter's speech, similar to the literary use of an inclusio, points to an emphasis that is not immediately clear from the normative text of LXX-Joel. Luke brackets and highlights his case that Jesus is the Lord of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 by the Joel quotation.¹⁴⁷ Luke seems to do this in order to emphasize the importance of the case made in 2:22–36 as not merely an add-on to Joel, nor human invention, nor even a separate speech melded with another. Instead, the Lukan appropriation of this normative text has an integral relationship with other prophetic witnesses that illustrate clearly both the identity of Jesus of Nazareth and the reality of the day in which all, universally, now stand. Key language from LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is threaded through Acts 2:22–39 to make Luke's case for Jesus' reign clear, including "God" and his sovereign action, the developing identity of "the Lord," and the emphasis placed on prophecy at each stage of the argument.

Continuing from the scope given by the Lukan Jesus in Acts 1:8, the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:5 and its language of "all those who are far off" looks to the rest of Acts by forecasting a universal call to salvation and witness under the name of the Lord Jesus. And finally, this unresolved scope of salvation and witness in the day of the Lord that Joel foretells makes LXX-Joel 3:1–5 a likely candidate for the hermeneutical key in relation to which Luke views the rest of the earliest day of the Lord recorded in Acts.

147 Crenshaw, *Joel*, 164, 167. Cf. Steyn, *Quotations*, 71.

IV Joel 3:1–5 in *The Testament of Judah* 24

The Testament of Judah (TJ) 24 contains strong allusions to Joel 3:1–5 as part of its eschatological program and is the text that we will set alongside Luke. This interpreter will be considered alongside of Luke as we explore their own readings of Joel 3:1–5.¹⁴⁸

IV.a *An Opening Note on the Context and Its Problems Regarding The Testament of Judah*

As a text, TJ is part of a collection of “testaments”¹⁴⁹ of the twelve sons of Jacob ostensibly given to their posterity at their deaths and modeled closely on Jacob’s testimony in Genesis 49:1–27. *The Testament of Judah* is structured very similarly, if not identically to, the typical structure for other “testaments” in the T12P. The structure of TJ shares characteristics with that of a literary pattern called the SER sequence.¹⁵⁰ SER stands for Sin-Exile-Return, and it is found in various forms in Jewish apocalyptic literature.¹⁵¹ At TJ 24, where Joel 3:1–5 is quoted, the movement of TJ is from E¹⁵² to R and, more specifically, into a portion of the R stage.¹⁵³ The testament of the fourth son of Jacob, Judah, to his offspring is characterized as the testimony of one declared to be king and

148 Cf. Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, “The Minor Prophets in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period,” in *Minor Prophets in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 22.

149 For more on the genre of “testaments,” see R. A. Kugler, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and James C. VanderKam, eds., “Testaments,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 933–36, ENCYC.

150 For more on this sequence in the T12P, see Marinus de Jonge, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin” (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953), 52–56.

151 Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 303.

152 For Judah’s descendants, the “SE” part of the sequence was a grim one. Many sins of the “spirit of error” await that threaten the kingly line of Judah (TJ, 23:1). This type of sin leads to the destruction of the temple and the enslavement of his line by the Gentile nations (TJ 23:3–5a), which is illustrated in TJ by weaving in echoes of many similar motifs from the Hebrew Bible and Early Jewish literature (cf. e.g., Jer. 25:11; 51:12; 52:13; Pss Sol 17:22; 2 Kings 25:9; 2 Chr. 36:19; 2 Esdras 1:52). Essentially, the line of Judah is stripped of everything that makes them unique and exceptional, namely, their regal role.

153 The “R” stage is typically called the “predictions” stage. Also, broadly speaking, the typical program of the T12P, although this program can vary from “testament” to “testament,” is one that highlights the life of the patriarch, his failures and his victories (both of which can tend to be quite legendary in nature), and finishes with a ‘paranaenetical’ word or saying to his lineage and his prediction for their future as a people. For more on this aspect of the “testament” genre, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 302.

therefore is of a kingly line (TJ 1:6; Cf. Gen. 49:8–12). The time of sin and exile for Judah's posterity is followed by a future age of a messianic figure,¹⁵⁴ the outpouring of the Spirit of God, and salvation. Unlike the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 that quotes the prophecy *en bloc* (except that the allusion to 3:5 in Acts 2:39), TJ 24 verbally alludes to Joel 3:1–5 at four points: (1) the future-oriented Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα (TJ 24:1)¹⁵⁵ which is continuous with LXX-Joel 3:1 but leaves out ἔσται (cf. Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα, LXX-Joel 3:1); (2) the outpouring of the Spirit upon God's people (TJ 24:2; cf. LXX-Joel 3:1); (3) the generally observed renewed obedience and inspiration of God's people (TJ 24:3; cf. LXX-Joel 3:1b–2); (4) the belief that salvation is found in "call[ing] upon the name of the Lord" (TJ 24:6b; cf. LXX-Joel 3:5).

Some concern has been expressed regarding Christian interpolation in this text and several stances exist on this.¹⁵⁶ However, any concern that there is

154 A messianic figure can commonly be found in the latter stages of the SER sequence in Early Jewish writings (cf. e.g., Ez. 34:11–24; 27:15–28; TS 7:2–3; TL 18:3; TZ 9:8). Cf. J. Julius Scott, *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 293; Rodrigo J. Morales, *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 71.

155 The T12P is preserved in Greek, Armenian, Slavonic, and fragments of TL in Aramaic. The English translation of de Jonge is preferred here ("The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin," 227) which is based on the extant Greek MSS, which are the most complete of other T12P MSS available. These MSS are believed by some important researchers to be the best in extant, vis-a-vis the Armenian and Slavonic. Cf. John J. Collins and Michael E. Stone, eds., "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress, 1984), 331–33; Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).

156 Stances concerning the origin of Christian interpolations include (1) None, and from a Jewish hand. Cf. Leonhardt-Balzer, "The Minor Prophets in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period," 22; Turner, *Power*, 85 n7. (2) With a strong Essene focus, see Marc Philonenko, *Les Interpolations Chrétiennes Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960); A Dupont-Sommer, "The Essene Writings from Qumran," in *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), 301–5. (3) The more traditional stance is that the T12P is originally a Jewish text with moderate to light Christian interpolation. Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913), 282–83; Jacob Jervell, Walther Eltester, Christoph Burchard, and Johannes Thomas, eds., "Ein Interpolator Interpretiert Zu der Christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen," in *Studien zu Den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1969); Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, "Herkunft und Sinn der Patriarchen-Reden in Den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen," in *Littérature Juive Entre Tenach et Mischna: Quelques Problèmes*, ed. W. C. van Unnik (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 29–47; H. C. Kee and James H. Charlesworth, eds., "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century B.C.): A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, vol. 1 (New York:

disruption to a pure “conversation” between interlocutors because of any reliance on Acts by TJ is misplaced, since it will be seen below that TJ 24 interprets Joel 3:1–5 uniquely and uses different supporting texts than does Luke to move his agenda forward. If one disagrees with our reading of TJ, it should be said that this would not undermine the overall thesis presented here.

iv.b *A Future Age of Restoration: “After These Things ...”*

TJ 24 casts a vision for a yet unrealized eschatological age that reinstates the reign of Judah’s lineage. The text of TJ 24 says that it is looking to a day of peace and restoration and from a purely literary perspective (though it likely suggests a reality that was true for whomever wrote TJ) this era is still anticipated after the day in which they stand (hence, Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, TJ 24:1; cf. LXX-Joel 3:1).

Closely aligning with theoretical models of utopia, TJ looks to the past to envisage a future free of exile and subservience. A messianic figure, after the image of Judah, and God’s Spirit will make this a reality. TJ 24:1, and more explicitly, TJ 24:4–5, speak of a day where the reign of a messiah based on the kingly nature of Judah’s line will rule, modeled closely after allusions to Is. 11:4–6 (cf. Num. 24:17; LXX-Mal. 3:20; TL 18:3; 4QFlor 10–15), leading one to see this prophecy in light of the anticipated kingly, Davidic messiah.¹⁵⁷

Doubleday, 1983), 1:777. Morales, *New Exodus*, 69–73. (4) And finally, Marinus de Jonge’s notably thorough yet minority stance that the T12P is a Christian document that appropriates Jewish motifs for its uses Cf. e.g., Harm W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, eds., “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Outside the Old Testament* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 13–36, esp. 22; Marinus de Jonge, “Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NT* 4, no. 3 (1960): 182–235. For more discussion on this debate, see Kee and Charlesworth, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century B.C.): A New Translation and Introduction,” 777; Rengstorff, “Zwölf Patriarchen,” 29–47; Philonenko, *Les Interpolations Chrétiennes*; Dupont-Sommer, “Essene Writings,” 301–5; Jonge, “Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 188–90; Morales, *New Exodus*, 69–73.

- 157 Many things can be discussed concerning the major role of the allusions to Is. 11 and the connections this text makes thematically with Joel 3 (cf. for the importance of Is. 11 in Early Jewish understandings of the Spirit and a messianic figure Turner, *Power*, 132–33, 136), and even the broader messianic themes in T12P. However, the focus of this study will not allow a fuller discussion of these things. But, probably one of the more pressing debates concerning the messiah in TJ 24 has been the possible traces of a dual-messiah (a priestly messiah and a kingly one) motif carried into the T12P from a broader Early Jewish apocalyptic tradition, that is believed to be found in Qumran documents. For views on this issue, see John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 141–43; D. S. Russell, “The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC–AD 100” (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 312–19; A. S. van der Woude, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), 217–49; Karl G. Kuhn, “The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel,” in *Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister

The messiah of TJ 24 is based on what is presumably a familiar golden age of this particular lineage and a model of a society that this family line seeks to return to. The desire to escape the presently occurring "SE" stage into the yet realized "R" stage is what aligns it with accepted theories of utopia. According to a theory of "contract," Frye says that this belief is based on the hope that a community has placed upon certain convictions about their past and how their past forms their belief of what future salvation from their present distress looks like.¹⁵⁸ The "contract" for Frye is Judah's storied and very hyperbolic recasting of his past mighty, kingly reign (e.g., TJ 3:5–7; cf. 1 Sam. 17:4), and the vision is of the restoration for his posterity of this specific reign that is modeled after Judah's tale.¹⁵⁹

The conviction, for TJ, in its "R" stage is that there is a time in the future that will restore the people of the age to come to a better version of a memory of past glory.¹⁶⁰ The temporal expectation of TJ 24, at least as far as the text reveals,

Stendahl and James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 54–64; Craig A. Evans, "The Two Sons of Oil: Early Evidence of Messianic Interpretation of Zechariah 4:14 in 4Q254 4 2," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Texts, Reformulated Issues, and Technological Innovations*, ed. D. Parry and E. Ulrich, STDJ (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 566–75. Craig A. Evans, "Diarchic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Messianism of Jesus of Nazareth," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress July 20–25, 1997*, ed. James C. VanderKam, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Emanuel Tov (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Israel Antiquities Authority, 2000), 558–67; Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S Frerichs, eds., *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); James H. Charlesworth, "The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity" (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992). According to his belief that the T12P are essentially Christian texts, de Jonge consistently refers to the messianic figure in the T12P as "Jesus Christ," and denies a dual-messiah, though his reasons for being so specific about the identity of the messiah appears to be based solely upon his suppositions about the text (cf. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin," 51–64).

158 Frye ("Varieties of Literary Utopias," in *Daedalus* [1965], 336) says,

"any serious utopia has to assume some kind of contract theory as the complement of itself, if only to explain what is wrong with the state of things the utopia is going to improve. But the vision of something better has to appeal to some contract behind the contract, something which existing society has lost, forfeited, rejected, or violated, and which the utopia itself is to restore."

159 See ("Utopia and Return: On the Structure of Utopian Thinking and Its Relation to Jewish-Christian Tradition," *JR* 73, no. 3 [1993]: 358) who notes,

"a vision of a better society should appeal to some kind of covenant, a founding character ... preceding the society, which society has lost, rejected, or violated, and which utopia itself is to restore."

160 Cf. Luz, "Utopia," 360.

is continuous with LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in its future orientation and the incorporation of an apocalyptic motif such as a messianic figure further confirms the anticipation of this coming age that will free this people from present distress.¹⁶¹

iv.c *The Outpouring of the Spirit upon the Sons of Truth*

The next way TJ 24 appropriates Joel 3:1–5 is by the outpouring of the Spirit upon God's people (TJ 24:2; cf. LXX-Joel 3:1). What TJ 24 calls "the blessing of the Spirit," that is poured out by the messianic figure, results in a generally observed renewed obedience and inspiration of God's people (TJ 24:3; cf. LXX-Joel 3:1b–2). TJ 24:2–3 says,

2And the heavens will be opened to him to pour out the blessing of the Spirit of the Holy Father, and he will pour the Spirit of grace upon you.
3And you will be sons to him in truth, and you will walk in his commandments from first to last.

For TJ, the outpouring of the Spirit has an integral connection to the ethics of God's people and his relationship to them (24:2). Stemming from what appears to be the blessing that the Spirit brings is a clearly defined "Father"/"children" relationship between God and Judah's offspring.

The blessing of the Spirit also appears to forge a similar relationship with the messianic figure. Earlier in TJ (23:1), the prediction of the text is for "my children" which is the natural antecedent for "you" in TJ 24:3. It appears most likely that "you" refers to the line of Judah throughout this passage. But what is interesting is that in the passage above at the beginning (24:2), God seems to be the one called "Holy Father" (πατὴρ ἅγιος; cf. e.g., Odes Sol. 31:5), but later in the passage the messianic figure takes on this role (cf. 24:3). Throughout, this figure is referred to with the third-person singular pronoun, "him." And from "him" the line of Judah will both receive the Spirit at the opening up of the heavens (with similar metaphorical language to the transfiguration in Mt. 9:1–8; Mk. 9:2–10; Lk. 9:28–36; 2 Pt. 1:17–18), and this line will be called "sons" who "walk in his commandments."

As a brief aside, there are some passages in the Second Temple literature that vaguely imply a "son of God" theme for the messiah, as TJ 24:3 insinuates here with πατὴρ ἁγίου (cf. e.g., CD-A [4Q174]; 1QS^{am}; 4Q369; cf. also, 4 Ezra 7,13, 14). It is possible to see the passage as a "son of God" passage, but it

161 Gershom Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism: And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 4–5 Cf. J. Julius Scott, *Jewish Backgrounds*, 310; Collins and Stone, "Testaments," 337.

seems best to regard this passage as one that sees the messianic figure taking on similar roles to the "Holy Father" when ruling the future line of Judah.¹⁶²

There is also an ethical cleansing that TJ anticipates with the coming of the Spirit. Similar ethical renewal upon the arrival of God's Spirit is found in many other Jewish texts upon the arrival of God's Spirit.¹⁶³ TJ 24 anticipates that the Spirit would enable Judah's lineage to "walk in his first and final decrees" (24:3). In harmony with other Early Jewish texts, the ethical renewal of Judah's posterity is also in relation to obedience expected in the time of a messianic figure (e.g., 1QS 9.9–11; CD 20.31; cf. Is. 11:1–4). For TJ 24, the gift that the Spirit of the Father brings, along with the anticipated rule of the messianic figure, is the Spiritual blessings of the Spirit of renewed obedience in Judah's line towards a better version of a time before the "SE" stages.

iv.d *Salvation: "Call upon the Name of the Lord"*

The final place where TJ 24 appropriates Joel 3:1–5 is in TJ 24:6b. The testament says that the messiah's rule will "arise to the nations to judge and *save all that call upon the name of the Lord*." The vision of TJ adopts the language of Joel 3:5, "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved." TJ utilizes Joel's prophecy where God's people are actively calling upon the Lord, instead of the other portion of Joel 3:5 where the language portrays the Lord's active call (cf. Joel 3:5d, "the survivors shall be those whom the Lord calls"). This choice may be due to the restored nature of God's people by his Spirit previously covered in TJ 23:2–3 that enables such volition. But this is not the most puzzling part of the anticipation of salvation foretold by Judah.

However, the aspect of universal salvation that is continuous between TJ 24 and Joel 3:1–5 appears at odds to a "testament" focused on a specific lineage and its future. More explanation is necessary. A natural reading of TJ would lead one to believe the prediction of a utopian age of restoration was for a specific lineage as this would be in harmony with what many believe to be the view of salvation from Early Jewish texts.¹⁶⁴ However, in two important

162 For more discussion on the characteristics of the "son of God," and discussion on other potential "son of God" passages see John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 163–69.

163 The expectation of a moral cleansing by God's spirit is throughout rabbinic writings, as Turner observes (*Power*, 120 n5, 6). See Turner's extensive study (*Power*, 119–33) for discussion on these rabbinic sources and discussions of similar expectations in later translations in the Targums, "LXX," Philo, Wisdom Literature, and fittingly for TJ 24, the same expectation in Is. 11 that is accompanied by a messianic figure.

164 For a fuller treatment of Early Jewish notions of salvation, see Mark Adam Elliot, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

places TJ 24 gives the impression that there is a broader audience of the salvation by virtue of the universal reign of the kingly messianic figure and the effused Spirit.

First, TJ 24:4 says, "... the branch of the God Most High ... is the fountain unto life for *all flesh*." "All flesh" is terminology that is key language from Joel 3:1, where it is said that the Spirit of God would be poured upon "all flesh."

Secondly, TJ 24:6 includes "the nations" and "all" as those who have access to calling upon the name of the Lord for salvation. The καί in TJ 24:6 that weds the possibility of judgment to the possibility of salvation would seem to suggest that, as with Judah's lineage, these two possibilities are open to the nations as well. For TJ, though it is a "testament" for a specific lineage, salvation, as with judgment, seems to be a possible reality to all because of the nature of the reign of Judah's line and their role to judge and save.

The reign of the Lord elsewhere in Jewish Scripture pictures the Lord as one over all nations and offering to all these nations a similar salvation to that of TJ 24. For example, LXX-Ps. 144, like TJ 24, paints a picture of the universal reign of the Lord "over all the earth" (LXX-Ps. 144:1, ὁ θεός μου ὁ βασιλεὺς μου; cf. 144:11, 12, 13 [2×]; 144:9, ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ), and the offer of salvation to "all" (πᾶς; 11 times in this Ps.) who would draw near to him in truth (LXX-Ps. 144:18). The rule of the king includes the offer of care and consequences to all under his reign. TJ 24 similarly offers a picture of an anticipated age when Judah's rule is one of truth, judgment, and salvation, not simply for a selected line, but because of the privilege of that line for all.

IV.e Summary

At four points, TJ 24 appropriates terminology and motifs from Joel 3:1–5 that furthers the "R" portion of its predictive SER sequence. With a strong analogy to models of utopia, TJ 24 looks to a still-awaited future where the line of Judah will recapture its past reign by the empowerment of God's Spirit, new obedience to God's commandments as a people by God's inspiration, and the ability to offer salvation or pass judgment upon a universal audience. To support its appeal to Joel 3:1–5 and its eschatological message, TJ looks to the figure of David by allusions to prophecies about his line from Is. 11. To be clear, a point to highlight is that the prophecy is *about* David and is not *David's own prophecy* as in Acts 2. David is regal in TJ 24 much like in Acts 13, but not in the way in which Luke intends him to be taken in Acts 2. For TJ, the future of this line, according to TJ 24, is a familiar one since it is based heavily upon the stories of the past and based on known Isaianic prophecies about the Davidic lineage, but is different because it gives a better vision of the future where God's

messiah will rule as king by the power of God's Spirit from the regal line of an ethically renewed Judah.

v Luke and *The Testament of Judah* 24: a Conversation among Readers

For Acts 2 and TJ 24, Joel 3:1–5 functions to further each author's agenda as an authoritative text. On its own, Joel 3:1–5 is possibly one of the most universalist texts in Jewish Scriptures. It promises a day, specifically "the day of the Lord," when the Lord's Spirit will be poured out on a never-quite-defined "all flesh," which brings about the direct inspiration of a generation-class-gender-inclusive subject and is accompanied by signs in the heavens. These aspects of that day of the Lord verify that such a day has arrived.

In sum, the emphasis of Joel 3:1–5 is on the promises of salvation for a Spirit-marked people. Calling upon the Lord's name in the day of his arrival promises to give shelter from the implied horrors and judgment of this day. As we concluded above, Joel 3:1–5 is about reign, renewal and salvation and not primarily about the horrors of judgment (though the contexts preceding it and following it do concern judgment).

While there appears to be a general lack of scholarly inquiry into potential interlocation between these two respective readers of Joel 3:1–5, setting Luke in conversation with TJ 24 might reveal more clearly the dynamic process in which a normative text goes through in its reception by later readers. Such interlocation tells us more about what Luke is doing when using LXX-Joel 3:1–5 (e.g., how he shares in a tradition of reading texts but where he makes distinguishing claims according to the context which he is exegeting).

In *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*,¹⁶⁵ Litwak treats specifically the reception of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 by Luke. Litwak claims the Lukan use of this text to be a "revisionary reading" according to the way Luke reads the theme of messianism into the text of Joel.¹⁶⁶ For Litwak, the text of Joel is "recontextualized" to its narrative situation in Acts 2 in order to establish ecclesiological continuity between God's people Israel and His new people who have the Holy Spirit in Acts 2. At the same time, it makes the case that this hermeneutical role of the use of this text expressly works against any notion that Joel 3:1–5 is used by Luke to "prove" or "fulfill" anything.¹⁶⁷ Litwak's proposal is where we should

¹⁶⁵ Litwak, *Echoes*.

¹⁶⁶ Litwak, *Echoes*, 157.

¹⁶⁷ Litwak, *Echoes*, 155–57, 160, 179.

begin the final section of this chapter, where we will observe the interaction between TJ 24 and Acts 2.

Certainly, as we have seen above, Luke *is* contemporizing LXX-Joel 3:1–5 when he appropriates it into his context; this is simply true of how Scripture is used by later readers when it is utilized in new historical settings. Outside of the Lukan use of LXX-Joel 3:1–5, we have specific evidence of such contemporizing or appropriation by its use in TJ 24. Like Luke, TJ 24 also contemporizes Joel 3:1–5 for its own needs that is like Luke's in that it has an eschatological trajectory. The difference is that one eschatology is realized, or at least partially (Acts 2), and another is still awaited, though contemporized for a specific need of an author and his community (TJ 24).

Specifically, we want to draw attention to how our two interpreters clarify themes of messianism. It is Litwak's suggestion what makes Luke's reading of Joel 3 a "revisionary reading" is the messianism in Acts 2 and recontextualization of Joel 3 to fit that theme. But is this what Luke or TJ 24 suggests, according to how they read Joel 3?

At this point in the chapter, one might observe that associating a messianic theme with Joel 3:1–5 is not unique to a Lukan reading. TJ 24 also associates messianism with this same text. So the "revisionary" aspect of Luke's reading must not be that theme exactly. Litwak's work did not place Luke amidst his milieu to see how Luke reads texts in light of this milieu and therefore did not hear the voice of *The Testament of Judah* in his work. One might agree with Litwak when he posits that messianism is foreign to a natural reading of Joel 3:1–5, but to a particular tradition of reading Joel 3:1–5 it is not. In fact, messianism somehow is part of the interpretive tradition of Joel 3, and is very much a point of significant agreement between TJ and Luke.

Both readers of Joel 3:1–5, TJ and Luke, hold in common that in order to locate a messianic theme in Joel 3:1–5, scriptural support outside of Joel's prophecy is necessary to provide support. For both Luke and TJ, the messianic motif had to be introduced via other more messianic texts. For Luke, the Psalms, namely LXX-Ps. 15 and LXX-Ps. 109, are essential to his case for Jesus' identity as the messiah. For the Lukan Peter, these Psalms enable him to proclaim with full certainty that Jesus is "Lord and Messiah" (Acts 2:36). For TJ, it is the allusions to the Davidic-messianic prophecy of Is. 11 that connects the messianic figure to the regal line of Judah.

For both texts, the figure of David looms large in their appeals to supporting Scriptures for their respective messianic reading of Joel 3:1–5. For TJ, Isaiah 11 modifies the messianic figure with a more traditional regal view of David. Isaiah 11 sees the figure of King David through the regal lineage that

Judah represents (i.e., the "root of Jesse"). For TJ vis-a-vis its reading of Joel 3:1–5, the general awareness of the Davidic messiah anticipated from Is. 11, as well as its regal and ruling expectations in the future, emphasizes a regal, messianic way of seeing David; this is the normal representation of David in Jewish and Christian texts.

Luke, however, takes the emphasis of the Davidic figure in another direction in Peter's speech. And an important distinction concerning David emerges when Luke is placed in interaction with TJ that is of central importance in reference to Luke's modification to the Jesus-messiah identity. For Luke, it is David *as prophet* that is used to prop up his case that Jesus is messiah *and* Lord; namely, the Lord expected in LXX-Joel 3:1–5.

By use of the prophetic witness of David, a less frequently appealed to role of the King of Israel, the "revisionary" portion of the Lukan reading is uncovered. Luke calls in David to make the case for Jesus as the arrived Lord-messiah which for Luke fulfills the expectation of the day in LXX-Joel 3:1–5. It is plausible that by virtue of David's unwavering belief in God's oath or covenant with God (Acts 2:30) and possibly his Spirit-led Psalm writing, the Jewish milieu had developed the prophetic role of David.

Of course, it should be noted that Jesus *is* for Luke a regal Davidic messiah, a theme that will be utilized by Luke later in Acts 13. But in Acts 2, this aspect of David is not the Lukan emphasis but the emphasis that TJ is putting forth. Instead, the use of the two Psalms is unique in view of the supporting texts that TJ uses from Isaiah in that Luke is saying that David was one who foresaw the person Jesus as messiah (as per the Lukan Peter in 2:36), while putting a greater emphasis upon his identity as Lord. David is called in, not as a regal figure who points to a descendant who will take his throne, but as a witness to God's redemptive plan, pointing to a "Holy One" who is incorruptible (Acts 2:27; LXX-Ps. 15:10) and who is Lord (Acts 2:34b–35; LXX-Ps. 110:1). The interlocution of TJ and Luke throws light on this difference in their use of David and its implication for the type of messiah they are claiming. This notable difference is not a subtle one but is foundational for the Lukan claim about Jesus' identity and for forward progress of his narrative.

According to Acts 2:36, Jesus is a Lord-messiah (καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός), which is a truly unique reading of all texts involved. The messiah Luke reads from Joel 3 is one who is Lord in the same way as Yahweh is Lord. While Luke and TJ would agree with each other that the text of Joel can be read with a messianic trajectory by the use of clearer supporting texts, the "anointing" of the messiah turns out to be different. TJ supports a more traditional view of the Davidic Messiah as an anointed regal messiah (again,

a theme picked up later by Luke). But the burden of the figure of David and LXX-Joel 3:1–5 does not fall so hard on the “messiah” aspect. Instead, Luke’s emphasis is upon what Jesus is anointed to be, namely, Lord.

Finally, Litwak would suggest that Luke’s use of these Psalms, especially LXX-Psalm 15, is not fulfillment but rather Luke “actualizing” the meaning of these texts. Litwak is entirely against any notion of fulfillment or proof being a part of the equation in the Lukan use of Scripture in Acts 2. Instead, he says that Luke actualizes these Psalms since “David’s words must have been about the Messiah.”¹⁶⁸ While it is not entirely clear how Litwak means to use the term “actualization,” or how it fits the context of Acts 2, it may be an enlightening term vis-a-vis the fictitious conversation between Luke and TJ (though working against Litwak’s case against proof and fulfillment).

How Litwak uses “actualization” seems assumed according to its common sense of making something happen, making something become a reality, or fulfilling something. In light of Luke’s usage of these two Psalms to support his reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5, actualization may not be a bad way of seeing things. Luke is claiming truth and certainty by his reading of these Psalms, both of which are intended to work in support of *what has become a true reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 according to the signs observed at Pentecost*.

But the question is, in the end, why does Luke feel it necessary to “actualize” the meaning rather than go with what might be the more natural way to read the text? Simply put, Luke cannot read the text “the natural way” or the way the text *must* be read. Like TJ, the only way Luke can read a text is according to a new context, and his reading of that text is an exegesis of that context. The messianic reading of a text by both of our interlocutors does not mean that the normative text itself “must have been” about a messiah, *pace* Litwak. Rather, the conversation thus demonstrates that their new context is about a messiah (and Lord, for Luke), and the text is read in that direction (Litwak reads it in the opposite direction). If Luke *is* “actualizing” (or appropriating the text) LXX-Joel 3:1–5 with support of two Psalms, again in spite of Litwak’s understanding, Luke is most naturally understood as making a case that Jesus is being anointed as Lord of the “last days.” This seems most natural because Luke is demonstrating that the context in which he and his contemporaries inhabit has fulfilled or actualized, LXX-Joel 3:1–5 with its supporting texts. It is the historical context that “must have meant something” and actualizes a text which means that actualization can only apply to a text that is read, appropriated, and applied with good reason. In other words, the text of Scripture (i.e. Joel 3:1–5) is fulfilled by the historical events surrounding Pentecost; it may

¹⁶⁸ Litwak, *Echoes*, 179.

also imply that many actualizations can exist (hence the use by TJ), and Luke takes advantage of that fact by making a case that Pentecost actualizes Joel 3. Therefore, when the crowd asks Peter in 2:12, "What does this mean?" that is Luke's opportunity to call witnesses, make a clear case by selected texts, and prove that the signs of that day mean that Jesus is the Lord-messiah—that a new day has dawned in fulfillment of LXX-Joel 3:1–5, thus laying the foundation for what is to come in Acts.

In the end, between the three interlocutors, there is steady agreement and continuity voiced regarding the eschatological nature of the day described and the Spirit that makes the day known to God's people. However, Luke stands in contrast to his two counterparts in that the day has, in part, been realized and therefore is no longer purely future. In other words, unlike TJ and of course Joel, the day of the Lord is presently inaugurated because Jesus is, in addition to messiah, the Lord that has ascended and poured forth the Spirit, according to LXX-Joel 3:1–5.

In his use of LXX-Joel 3:1–5, Luke indeed envisages Jesus as such a messiah that TJ might have hoped for, but more than that, Luke reads and utilizes the passage in order to begin his program. Luke reads and appropriates the prophet Joel in order to make the case that the signs that Peter and his audience are experiencing are those that would indicate that "these last days" are the day of the Lord. In order to make the case that Jesus is that Lord, Luke calls upon the prophet Jesus (a view of Jesus that was apparently acceptable to those to whom he is making his case since that identity seems assumed), by recounting specific and brief traditions about Jesus and the prophet David by a reading of the Psalms. Importantly, it is the crowd's confession of Jesus in a substantial majority (see Acts 2:40) that is the deciding witness that affirms the Lukan reading of Joel as the right one; namely that Jesus is the Lord who sits at the right hand of God and pours forth the Spirit on a confessing people as Joel and those before and after him had predicted. Luke's voice, therefore, stands out with distinction concerning his views on the Lord and his messianic interpretation of this passage.

One area, however, remains still a mystery; namely, who are the people that this "day" concerns? While all three interlocutors use "all flesh" to make an ecclesiological statement about the people of God marked by an outpoured Spirit, ambiguity marks its meaning. "All flesh" for both Joel and TJ is plausibly taken to mean God's people, Israel, though with subtle equivocation. Luke, however, seems intentionally to leave the conversation open-ended regarding any final definition of who the people are whom the Spirit sets apart, especially if the phrase "all who are far off" (Acts 2:39) is seen with a trajectory towards the rest of Acts. This point also shows why the conversation between Luke and

his two counterparts is an important one. Though the initial outpouring of the Spirit on a select people happens in Acts 2 where the confession of Jesus as Lord by repentance validates the Lukan reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and confirms Jesus' identity, Luke does not come to a conclusion concerning what people Joel is expecting—ecclesiology is not a topic of importance emerging from this conversation, nor is it Luke's emphasis as we can now see with the conversation in full view. Rather, Luke is laying the foundation for what is to come by first, making a clear case that LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is talking about Jesus and the day that Jesus' ascension inaugurates. As the day of the Lord according to Acts unfolds, and, according to the evidence presented here, as the Lukan construal of the LXX-TP gains traction in the narrative, greater light will be shed on this "day" and what impact it has on this topic of ecclesiology vis-a-vis the universal lordship of Jesus and its implications.

“Forty Years”: the Divided People of God and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43

The Text of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 and of Acts 7:42–43

LXX-Amos 5:25–27

²⁵ μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηγάγκατέ μοι [ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ]¹ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ; ²⁶ καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολοχ καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ραίφαν, τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν, οὓς ἐποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς. ²⁷ καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Δαμασκοῦ, λέγει κύριος, ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.

Acts 7:42–43

μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηγάγκατέ μοι
 ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ;
 43 καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ
 καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥαίφάν,
 τοὺς τύπους [] οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς,
 καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος.

I Introduction

The second Book-of-the-Twelve quotation in Acts is Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42b–43. It is located in the Lukan Stephen’s defense speech before the Sanhedrin. In this speech, Stephen responds to three charges (cf. 6:11–14), and Scripture stands at the heart of his speech, quoted and retold.²

- 1 The bracketed phrase does not appear in the main text of Ziegler’s critical edition. The phrase “in the desert” is likely an interpretive explanation for what “forty years” means. On its appearance in MS B, e.g., see Glenny, *Amos*, 107.
- 2 Stephen responds to these charges with his own story of Israel’s past, moving from Abraham (7:2–8), to Joseph (7:9–16), then to Moses (7:17–43) where the speech turns from a subtly didactic and tacitly accusatory history of Israel, to a polemical history at 7:35. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 364.

The location of the Lukan appeal to Amos 5 in Stephen's speech has been a primary problem for this section of Acts and seems to remain a riddle for Lukan scholars. Specifically, the quotation does not seem to cohere with its literary or historical chronological context. For example, the quotation's allusion to the Babylonian exile in 7:43, a Lukan emendation, and mention of star worship seems awkwardly to transition from an incomplete version of the paradigmatic wilderness idolatry to a case of pre-exilic prophecy, a threat of exile, and characteristically exilic idolatry.³ Questions swirl around this transition, especially regarding Luke's chronology and possible contradictions. For example, Pervo points out that it would seem that "Amos 5:25 disagrees with the Pentateuchal tradition about sacrifices during the wilderness period."⁴ And Jervell observes that "several commentaries argue that v 42" contradicts what follows.⁵ The most generally observed response to this problem has been one that works within the assumption that the Lukan Stephen intends his quotation of LXX-Amos to fit within a precise chronology. Under such *a priori* judgment, many, therefore, merely believe that the Lukan Stephen must have made a sizeable redemptive-historical jump from the wilderness period to the period of Israel's exile⁶ and then for reasons unknown returns to Moses in 7:42.⁷ Others, however, have attempted other intertextual methods to remedy the apparent problem.⁸

It is the task of this chapter to assess the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 with those stated presenting problems in mind. It is

3 Huub van de Sandt ("Amos 5,25–27") notes these problems and other less substantial ones.

4 Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 189. Cf. Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 368.

5 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 243. My translation. However, in agreement with Jervell's note, we believe that the contradiction "can be resolved."

6 Cf. e.g., James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996), 96.

7 Cf. Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 145.

8 As it was covered in the introduction (section 11.a.1), van de Sandt offers a complex intertextual solution in his article "Amos 5,25–27". Essentially, van de Sandt suggests that Luke replaces the Pentateuchal pericope, Deut. 4:27–28 with Amos 5:25–27 because, for Luke, it more effectively connects the sin in the wilderness with the fulfillment of God's promise to exile Israel if they worship other gods, and they will worship other gods when they are exiled. The complexity and exegetical depth of van de Sandt's proposal is noteworthy. van de Sandt's study is very complex, detailed, and enlightening on many points. However, the problem with his overall method is that he appeals to extra-Acts 7 contexts and an extra-Amos 5 text to solve the interpretive difficulties. These claims (1) fundamentally undermines Luke's belief, inherently by explicitly quoting Amos 5:25–27, the authority and clear purpose the text holds on its own terms, and not the Pentateuch, and (2) it questions the Lukan volition by, essentially, suggesting that the Lukan Stephen intended another Scripture for his context than the one that is actually present in Acts 7. The integrity of both aspects is fundamental to the interpretation of the Lukan reading of this text. Another review of this work was presented at ETS in Glenny, "Amos Quotations".

suggested that Luke appropriates LXX-Amos 5:25–27 as his normative text and its function is as a hermeneutical lens that draws together two eras of Israel by typology in order to reveal a pattern of Israelite behavior that extends into his day. Luke's use of Amos is harmonious with a tradition of interpretation that treats Amos with an authoritative prophet. Additionally, with reference to Amos 5:25–27, there is evidence to suggest that this text is used hermeneutically in Luke's milieu. A conversation among three interlocutors bears out these aspects of the function of Amos 5 in Acts 7. For this chapter, Luke will converse with CD-A (7:13–8:1).

II "Forty Years": Amos 5:25–27 as a Look Back to the Exodus

Amos 5:25–27 is situated in the larger pericope commonly called "the book of Woes" (Amos 5:1–6:14).⁹ Its place in the prophecy is uniquely placed at the moment when the Lord breaks from his focus on Israel's present unrighteousness and acts of injustice and his judgment of Israel for these things and points to an ideal time in their past and to a future time of exilic-judgment.¹⁰ The Lord's judgment upon Israel is for not seeking him, "the good" (5:4–5; 5:14).¹¹ The prophecy is concerned with the people of God who have effectively replaced the Lord with other ways, by idolatrous forms of worship and by prototypical idols that are generally known.

According to Amos, Israel believes that they will be secure in the day of the Lord and its judgment that is quickly approaching. At one point, Amos appears to quote Israel's confidence that the Lord will be with them (5:14).¹² But, including 5:25–27, Amos has made it a practice to appeal to Israel's history and heritage to demonstrate that they are not secure and the Lord is not with them.¹³ First, in 5:17, the prophet alludes to the Passover in Exodus 12. In this

9 For more on the "woe-oracle" tradition see Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 242–45; Kenneth D. Mulzac, "Amos 5:18–20 in Its Exegetical and Theological Context," *AJT* 16, no. 2 (2002): 288–90.

10 It is hard to know how closely LXX-Amos imitates Hebrew verse at this juncture, but according to the Hebrew, verse is interrupted by a prose-style in 5:25–27 for the Lord's look back to history and his look forward to the future. Cf. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 257; Mulzac, "Amos 5," 287.

11 Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 250. Cf. also, Larry J. Rector, "Israel's Rejected Worship: An Exegesis of Amos 5," *RQ* 21, no. 3 (1978): 170.

12 Shalom M. Paul, *Amos* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 176.

13 Mulzac ("Amos 5," 170–71) points to the material prosperity of Israel in the era of the prophet Amos what they believed pointed to the Lord's presence with them. However, Mulzac notes correctly "At [5:14–17] Amos supposedly quotes his audience's favorite statement, 'God is with us,' but disavows any connection with it."

great reversal, God promises to “pass through, in the midst of you” as he did the Egyptians in the Exodus.¹⁴ And Israel’s outcry in that day will also be comparable to that of the Egyptians (cf. 5:16; Ex. 12:29–30).¹⁵

However, Israel still believes that they can hope in the day of the Lord as their salvation. But this appeal to Israel’s heritage, too, is without hope.¹⁶ Three major views exist concerning the nature of this day, but von Rad’s is the most likely.¹⁷ As per von Rad, Israel hopes in the Lord to take up a holy war against their national enemies and defend his people.¹⁸ However, in a great reversal, Israel has become God’s enemy according to the prophet in 5:16–17, presumably by seeking “the evil” (which one can assume is the thing that is “not the Lord” since the Lord is “the good”) that 5:14–17 told them to “hate.”

In the past, Israel has escaped from judgment and has been preserved by the Lord, but the illustration is given in 5:18–20 of the fleeing man who narrowly escapes a lion, only to be met by a bear, and of a man who is struck by a snake in his place of comfort (i.e., his home). Both outcomes represent the Lord’s inescapable judgment Israel now faces in the Lord’s day.¹⁹ The Lord’s presence among Israel, once associated with blessing and life (5:14), is now associated with cries of lamentation and death (5:16–17). Therefore, because of Israel’s choice for “the evil thing,” which means that they have turned from the Lord who is “the good,” their desire for the day of the Lord is like their desire for meat in the Exodus in that it will only be to their judgment (cf. Numbers 11:10–34; Ps. 106:14).²⁰ The verses (esp. 5:14–24) that precede and make up the context of the passage in question, namely 5:25–27, run-up to the verses in question with force. They set the stage for the reason for “exile” and the evil that the idols of verse 26 have brought on the Lord’s people.

14 Paul, *Amos*, 180–81.

15 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 515–16.

16 Mays, *Amos*, 103–5.

17 The three other major views are Gressmann’s suggestion that the day of the Lord is an eschatological myth borrowed from other religions; Mowinckel’s view that it was a New Year’s festival celebrating the Lord’s his victory over his enemies and a renewal of prosperity for his people; and Černý’s view that it was an Israelite invention that made the old theophanic traditions a formula showing how the Lord would act in Israel’s national future. For more on the debate concerning the day of the Lord, see Mays, *Amos*, 103–5.

18 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 521; Mays, *Amos*, 104–5.

19 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 522; Paul, *Amos*, 186; Glenný, *Amos*, 102; Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 257.

20 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 520–21.

11.a *Sacrifice or Allegiance to the Lord?*

Following the reality of the day of the Lord, we find our passage being taken up in the context of sacrifice and festivals. Presumably, the appeal of the prophet (by the mouth of the Lord) in 5:25–26 to the Exodus era (cf. LXX-Amos 5:25, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη²¹) is against Israel's claim that they at least sacrifice to the Lord. But the Lord says in 5:21–23 that he is offended by Israel's sacrifice.²² However, the appeal to an ideal period in 5:25 is rhetorically effective, because it points to a gilded age when Israel sought the Lord, much like the appeals to a utopia we saw in the previous chapter.²³ It simply would not make sense to appeal to another age of rebellion.

LXX-Amos 5:25 says, "You did not offer to me sacrificial victims and sacrifices in the wilderness for forty years, did you, O House of Israel?" The rhetorical question is meant to be answered with a definitive "no." Though, as Wolff suggests, it is difficult to actually prove that sacrifices were not offered during this era in Israel's history,²⁴ Shalom Paul is right to say that what the prophet seeks to highlight is that the cornerstone of the Exodus period, the period that Amos suggests Israel believes is an "idyllic" point in their past, is not based upon "the existence of, or obedience to, any elaborate sacrificial system" but solely upon [their relationship with the Lord and its corresponding] "commitment to an ethical-moral way of life" (cf. Jer. 7:22–23).²⁵ Mays puts it more strongly (but maybe too definitively), saying, "for Jeremiah and Amos, at least, sacrifice had no authorized place in the constitution of Israel as the people of Yahweh."²⁶ Of course, sacrifice does have a place according to many places in the law, but allegiance to the Lord alone is the desired route.

However, according to the prophet, now Israel is taking comfort in the belief that their lavish sacrificial festivals and music will be pleasing to the Lord. Their allegiance has become connected to the pomp and circumstance of their sacrifice, which in essence glorifies their wealth and status and not their Lord. In reality, the prophet proclaims, they have broken covenant with the Lord by their actions including oppression of the poor by the wealthy (2:7; 4:10; 5:10–12); human trafficking (2:6); violence and stealing (3:9–10); not forgiving debts (5:11); taking bribes and stripping the poor of their rights (5:12); ruling with

21 See Glenny's comment on the absence of ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ in some LXX MSS in *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009), 181 n132 and Glenny, *Amos*, 108–9.

22 Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 257.

23 Paul, *Amos*, 194.

24 Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 264–65.

25 Paul, *Amos*, 193.

26 Mays, *Amos*, 111.

violence (6:3); turning the good things into the evil (6:12); sexual immorality (2:7); and idolatry in 5:26–27 (cf. also 8:14). But now their ceremonial behavior has become a true reflection of their heart and ethical behavior that the Lord judges.²⁷ In fact, Paul is probably right to say that Israel's "lavish and excessive" festivals starkly contrast the frugal ones that might have existed in the Exodus by which Israel sought the Lord, rather than a specific localization of worship (cf. Amos 5:4b–5). Andersen and Freedman note that 5:22–23 and its orchestral set-up and sacrificial location, preserve and affirm the belief that Yahweh's presence is localized in the shrine (it is his "palace"), and that the worshipers come there to perform for his entertainment and pleasure.²⁸

11.b *Prototypical Idols from the Exodus in 5:26*

The only comparison to these festivals of Israel's day is Israel's idolistic worship of Moloch and Raiphan (LXX-Amos 5:26, cf. 5:4b–5).²⁹ Much ink has been spilt on the names of these gods, and even the difference in the names between LXX-Amos and MT-Amos (Sikkuth your king, and Kiyyun your star-god).³⁰ It is important to remember that Luke was reading a Greek text that could be best called a proto-Alexandrian text recension. The importance of this is that, according to Jennifer Dines and W. Edward Glenny, the B (Vaticanus) makes the context in Amos 5 the Exodus from Egypt and not the Exile. B is similar to the context painted by the Hebrew-MT.³¹

Importantly, the καί that weds 5:25 to 26, and then 26 to 27 (v. 27 speaking about the consequences of 25–26) connects the contexts of the three verses.³² This means that, at least for the Greek version of Amos, the context is not a contemporary one for Amos, but one harking back to the wilderness period of the Exodus. Furthermore, Dines points out that the word τύπος that is connected to these mysterious idols noted by the prophet is a word that is common for "statue" or "image" in Koine Greek. In this context, Dines suggests, τύπος would point to the fact that these idols were "prototypes for subsequent idols."³³ If what Dines says is so (and this makes the most sense of the ambiguity that marks the prophet's appeal to these idols), it gives some reason to believe what others have gone as far as suggesting, namely, that Amos could be playing fast

²⁷ Paul, *Amos*, 192.

²⁸ Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 527–28.

²⁹ Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 528. Cf. Mays, *Amos*, 99; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 241.

³⁰ For more on the textual issues see Jennifer M. Dines, "The Septuagint of Amos: A Study of Interpretation," unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of London, 1992), 165–69.

³¹ Glenny, *Amos*, 107–8; Dines, "Amos," 165–66.

³² Glenny, *Amos*, 107, 109.

³³ Dines, "Amos," 169.

and loose with the names of the gods of verse 26 in order to satirize their processionalists.³⁴ Either way, instead of the emphasis falling on the identity of the idols, the emphasis for LXX-Amos is upon context, which for him is the Exodus and the waywardness of Israel's allegiance and demonstrated by the making of other gods by their own hands. In the end, the emphasis should remain upon the fact that the Lord does not desire the sacrifices that the idols receive.³⁵

In contrast, according to Amos, the Lord desires his people's allegiance to him as Lord, as evidenced by their ethical and moral devotion to him.³⁶ Israel felt as though they could find shelter in their festivals offered to the Lord since the Lord did institute some of them as Andersen and Freedman note.³⁷ But only when "justice rolls" (5:24) and is established at the gate will Israel's repentance be true. As the Lord has always preferred, the seeking out of the "good thing" (5:4–5, 14) is always preferable to the sacrifices of Israel (cf. e.g., 1 Sam. 15:22; Is. 1:11–14; Jer. 7:22).³⁸ But Israel's sacrificial habits demonstrate their complete inability to seek this thing, and ultimately, the Lord himself.³⁹

Amos' use of the history and heritage of Israel to make the word of judgment from the mouth of the Lord is a clear device to make their future situation evident, namely, that the Lord is not with them and they are headed to exile.⁴⁰ His role as a prophet and use of history to illustrate a future reality covered in 5:27 is put incisively by Andersen and Freedman,

A judicious balance needs to be struck, one in which the prophet's role as conservator of ancient tradition is blended with that of radical critic of current behavior and intention. The prophet stood as a vigorous denouncer of the dichotomy between worship at the temples and practice in all other areas of life.⁴¹

Andersen and Freedman are right according to what the text itself says, but they could be more forceful about how the prophet intends his words to land up the ears of his audience. According to the prophet, there is no dichotomy. Israel is choosing the evil in the temple and the public square. They are committing

34 Paul, *Amos*, 195–97.

35 Glenny, *Amos*, 107; Glenny, *Meaning*, 136.

36 Mays, *Amos*, 111.

37 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 529.

38 Richard S. Cripps, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos* (London: SPCK, 1969), 342–48.

39 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 507.

40 Cf. Rector, "Rejected Worship," 170–72.

41 Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 539.

social injustice while also worshiping idols in the place of worship. The worship of God's people reflected quite well the offenses of their injustice in the public square and starkly contrasts the idyllic Exodus period when they chose the good. Therefore, the Lord gives them what they want (i.e., καὶ ἀνελάβετε ... τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν) and now Israel cannot escape the judgment of the Lord, because they have completely turned from him in every arena of life and worship (this is, in spite of the "perhaps" of 5:15).⁴²

II.C *Relocation and Exile in 5:27*

The implications of Israel's actions and the Lord's judgment are found in 5:27, connected by the final καί, the conjunction that has wedded these three poetical verses that retell Israel's Exodus idolatry by the prophet in its Greek form. This final portion of 5:25–27 is unlike the first two-thirds in that it is a prediction of an imminent future.⁴³ However, it too, is connected to Israel's heritage. Amos 5:27 says, "I will relocate you to another land beyond Damascus, says the Lord God, Almighty is his name." The Lord says that he, himself, will exile his people.⁴⁴ Amos makes it clear in 5:27, with his language of captivity, that Israel has finally betrayed their covenant with the Lord in 5:27. In 5:27 the subject is the Lord who fulfills the covenant curse by sending into exile those who offend his covenant. According to Amos 5:27, that is "beyond Damascus." Such captivity is what is promised to Israel in Deut. 4:25–28. This passage from the law describes complete turning from the Lord, which means injustice and lawlessness in the public square (Deut. 4:25a) also reflected by the worship of false gods (4:25b, 28). The result for Israel, according to Amos, is not a new thing, but the promise of exile brought on by their failure to seek the good.

The captivity of Israel, the day of the Lord, and Israel's sacrificial system is a great reversal of history. As Mays correctly notes,

the God who delivered [Israel] from Egyptian captivity will bring them back into a new bondage. The verb [exile] which belongs to Yahweh is

42 Andersen and Freedman's discussion on the "perhaps" of 5:15 is intriguing. Early in their comment they seem to believe there may be a glimmer of hope for Israel (cf. *Amos*, 510–12), but conclude that there is no repentance and therefore, likely, no mercy given (cf. *Amos*, 533, 538). Cf. Paul, *Amos*, 178. In connection with the "perhaps" is the issue of the "remnant of Joseph." This remnant should not be viewed as an object of hope, but rather the furthering of the unfortunate situation of Israel—that only a few of all of them might escape. For more discussion on the remnant, see Paul, *Amos*, 178, 191, 192; Mays, *Amos*, 102.

43 Paul, *Amos*, 198.

44 Exile has been one of the key themes for Amos: 6:7; 7:11, 17; 9:4, 9 and against the nations in 1:5, 15. Cf. Paul, *Amos*, 198 n88.

subject in this announcement means the complete reversal of salvation-history. No historical agent is mentioned; this calamity belongs to the history which Yahweh creates.⁴⁵

Like Deut. 4, the Lord tells Israel to take their false gods and go elsewhere. The region to which he sends them is nondescript and is simply "a place where exiles go."⁴⁶ Essentially, the Lord exposes his people to another nation and region without his protection and tells them that if they want to worship and act as they are it will be without him in another location. His protection and mercy has been their salvation (Amos 2:10), but in exile this is revoked.⁴⁷

11.d *Summary*

Amos 5:25–27 is a pericope that stands in literary contrast to its context. These two verses break from the prophetic pronouncements upon Israel's current situation in order to look to their history and heritage. Although implicitly, this history lesson asks of God's people what their current ethical behavior may say about the judgment that is just over the horizon.

Unfortunately for Israel, their complete breaking of their covenant with the Lord in the arena of worship and ethics has caused many great reversals. Where the Lord had defended them in the past by the Passover, in the day of the Lord their fortunes are now reversed. The rhetorical mention of the Exodus as a gilded age of choosing "the good" (even if this is not a completely accurate historical portrayal of the Exodus, by the prophet), is now juxtaposed by the prophet with Amos 5:26–27. Israel, by their own choice, has chosen "not the Lord" (i.e., "the evil") in every aspect of their life, religious and public, and have therefore set themselves against the Lord as his enemy. The only thing the Lord requires is Israel to seek him, which according to Deuteronomy 4:29–31 would keep Israel from exile. This, however, is not the reality of Israel's choice, and exile is imminent. They have chosen "not God," so to speak, and now are being sent to a place that can best be understood as "not Israel."

45 Mays, *Amos*, 113.

46 Mays, *Amos*, 113. Paul (*Amos*, 198) says that Amos leaves the location of exile undefined to create "psychological tension." It would seem difficult to know the mind of the people of Israel, but Paul's observation is a generally observed psychological phenomenon when humans are in time of uncertainty. Paul more helpfully notes the irony in Israel's exile. He notes that according to 2 Kings 14:28 Israel's military victory had taken their national boundaries as far as Damascus, yet their downfall takes them further in exile. The Lord sends Israel beyond their land, which would seem to insinuate, into enemy territory.

47 Paul, *Amos*, 193.

III Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43

The Amos 5:25–27 quotation in Acts 7:42–43 has faced many interpretive challenges. The challenges are not necessarily with the text itself, such as we have faced in the Lukan quotation of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and will face with the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12. Instead, it is a question of the reading of this particular text within its prescribed context in Acts 7, and its function within that context. Keener has also observed this fact: “The exact sense of Amos’s prophecy is disputed, and its history of interpretation is diverse.”⁴⁸ The quotation seems awkwardly placed Stephen’s speech, between a harsh critique of Israel’s dealings with Moses and a biting Temple polemic. Its location has caused troubles for many when understanding its role in the speech.⁴⁹ Additionally, its appeal to exilic idolatry does not seem to make sense in light of the fact that the Lukan Stephen is addressing the calf idolatry in the Exodus.⁵⁰ The task of this section is to investigate the specific purpose for which Luke intended Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43, and how he, therefore, reads it in its literary and overall context.

The riddle of this quotation draws into focus the need to take another look at the context in which the Lukan Stephen has situated it in his speech. It has been commonly suggested that pattern typology plays a major role in Stephen’s speech.⁵¹ In Acts 7:35,⁵² Stephen’s story of Israel turns polemical with the most often noted pattern between Moses and Jesus in 7:35–38, which is in large part an allusion to the previous exposition by the Lukan Peter in Acts 3:15–26.⁵³

48 Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: 3:1–14:28* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013), 1409.

49 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 243.

50 Cf. Pervo, *Acts*, 189; Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 368.

51 Cf. e.g., Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 364; Johnson, *Acts*, 132; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 299.

52 Literary structure will not take center stage in this present discussion of the Lukan Stephen’s appropriation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27. However, it will be assumed that the speech takes a noticeable turn at 7:35; a turn that begins a polemic against Israel’s pattern of turning from God’s provision to their own way, for which Stephen’s appeal to Scripture provides support. Cf. Jacques Dupont, “La Structure Oratoire Du Discours d’Étienne (Actes 7),” *Biblica* 66, no. 2 (1985): 153–67; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 54; Haenchen, *Acts*, 288–89; Pervo, *Acts*, 178–79; Gaventa, *Acts*, 119; José Comblin, “La Paix Dans La Théologie de Saint Luc,” *ETL* 32, no. 3–4 (1956): 439–60.

53 Haenchen, *Acts*, 288–89. Cf., also, Dunn, *Acts*, 94; Tannehill, *Acts*, 91; Gaventa, *Acts*, 127; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 239–40; Johnson, *Acts*, 129, 138, and most commentaries; also E. Jane Via, “An Interpretation of Acts 7:35–37 from the Perspective of Major Themes in Luke-Acts,” in *Seminar Papers*, ed. Paul Achtemeier (New Orleans: SBL, 1978), 218 Via, “An Interpretation,” 218. Some suppose (Cf. David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 155), due to the dearth

Darrell Bock has suggested that Israel's "unfaithfulness has taken on a pattern of typology in the nation long before Stephen's time."⁵⁴ He continues on this point saying, "[this typology] extended itself through generations ... even beyond what Amos predicted."⁵⁵ It seems that Bock is on to something, but caution is warranted if one is reading the Amos quotation too literally even within a matrix of typology. Such a reading, it could be suggested, has led to many of the problems surrounding this quotation and its role in Stephen's speech—namely, it has been read with a great deal of either historical or literary chronological literalness. Dunn's puzzlement is a good example of this: "7.42–43 is the most astonishing jump in the speech since it takes the link provided by Amos 5.25 and associates the idolatry of the golden calf immediately with the worship of the star gods ..."⁵⁶ In sum, the quotation has significant importance to Stephen's speech, but to understand its place it must be read with fresh eyes and according to the pattern that Luke intended.

III.a *The Argument: Luke's Reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 as Typology in Acts 7*

It is most often argued that the quotation should be read in a linear fashion. According to this view, the quotation is part of the Lukan Stephen's history of Israel, where the place of "the exilic" portion of Stephen's history is missing and the quotation is its place-filler. It is believed that it is used by Stephen to recount the disobedience in this era. This point of view may be guilty of reading too far into the text. Instead, it is a scriptural passage that ties two eras together to demonstrate a pattern. Amos 5:25–27 functions as this tie between two eras. It is a hermeneutical text for Stephen.

The two eras are the Exodus and Stephen's present day. Beginning with the first era at 7:35 the Exodus is for Israel an era looked back upon as an idyllic age for Israel (refer back to our discussion of utopia in the previous chapter, since for some Jewish authors this is how the age of the Exodus was viewed⁵⁷)

of instances of the Moses/Jesus typology in the gospels that Luke uses a pre-Lukan Moses/Jesus typology in Acts 3:22 and 7:22. It is hard to either confirm or deny this supposition. Cf. Keener (*Acts: 3:7–14:28*, 1403) for more on this as a unique Lukan interpretation. It is certainly different than the analogy between the one that the author of Hebrews draws in Heb. 3:1–6, which may call Aune's supposition into question (discussed below briefly).

54 Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 299.

55 Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 300.

56 Dunn, *Acts*, 96.

57 Probably the best example of 'hagiofy-ing' or canonizing this era is found in Josephus who reports a joyfully obedient Israel under Moses. Cf. esp. his recounting of Exodus 32 in *Ant.* 3.79–99. Philo in *Mos.* 2.161–73 is much more sober about the situation, and Pseudo-Philo is much like Philo, though with its own embellishments (cf. Pseudo-Philo 12:1–10).

under their prophet and commander, Moses. Stephen, however, will suggest to his accusers. Second, Stephen leads his accusers to the present day, of the “last days” of “the Righteous One,” the Lord Jesus. Both eras are brought together by a rather appropriate, though enigmatic, text, Amos 5:25–27. We observe at this stage Stephen does not ignore his accusers in 6:11–14 as some have suggested,⁵⁸ but actually answers them with LXX-Amos 5:25–27 standing at the center of his answer, thus making relevant his extended history via analogy to their shared (Jew and Christian, Stephen and accuser) context.

By the quotation of this text, Luke intends to show that sole allegiance to the temple follows the type of the past, where Israel rejected the Lord’s patterns for their patterns, as they are now doing vis-a-vis the Lord, Jesus. To make his point clear, Luke intends the quotation not to follow chronologically, but to create the hermeneutical connection by analogy between God’s provisions in an ideal time in Israel’s past, the Exodus, and their rejection of him then and his ideal provision in the Lukan Stephen’s present-day of “The Righteous One” and their rejection of him as well.

By three types, we will explore the role of this quotation and how it ties the calf idolatry to the perception of temple in Stephen’s day, vis-a-vis Jesus as “Righteous” Lord. Each of these three steps is a typology that is built around the LXX-Amos 5:25–27, and in the end shows that Israel’s choice is of the idol and not the Lord, the temple system instead of “the Righteous One,” the Lord and Messiah Jesus. The hermeneutic of typology is important for the Lukan Stephen, because it shows how he understands the relationship between Israel’s past and their present. This is most clearly seen by its use in 7:43 and 7:44 of τύπος. (τύπος took on a contextual meaning, as per Dines, in the normative text, as a general pattern of idolatry; here in Acts, it continues to do the same, though it becomes the type for the pattern of Israel’s past and present.)

The setting of the twice-occurring τύπος and the place of the quotation at the center of Stephen’s telling of Israel’s calf-idolatry and temple polemic contextually serves to tie the era of the Exodus to the present day via the quotation of LXX-Amos 5. In its essence, the quotation is quite tightly wedded verbally with its context, but first we begin with the accusers’ statement that Stephen (and in fact all of Jesus’ followers) blaspheme against Moses and God and show that the context of Acts (specifically Acts 2–3) shows it is not the Christians but the Jews who do this, from the Exodus until now.

58 Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947), 49; Lake and Cadbury, *Commentary*, 70; Haenchen, *Acts*, 287, 290.

In this first step, we will give attention to “the prophet like me” motif. Then we will look at a typology of Moses as “law-giver” in 7:37 (ὁς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν) and Jesus’ role as “Spirit-giver” as the fulfillment of that type with reference to the Holy Spirit in 7:51 (referencing most clearly 2:33, 38). Last, we will look at the final accusation made against Stephen and the Jesus-followers, namely that they speak against “this holy place” (i.e., the Temple in Jerusalem). This final response is one where Stephen makes it clear that the Jews, like their fathers, have rejected the Lord’s pattern for their own “type” or pattern of worship and have thus, again, rejected the Lord—then with the calf and various prototypical idols and now the temple vis-a-vis Jesus the Lord of the ‘day.’ It is our belief that the LXX-Amos 5:25–27 quotation, far from being an oblique or incorrect appeal to Scripture, reveals this reality by its integral redemptive-historical interpretive analogy between eras and is not either an ancillary nor mistaken verse.

III.b *The Place of the Quotation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Stephen’s Speech*

The Lukan Stephen’s appropriation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 is situated between two appeals to Moses.⁵⁹ It is located at the end of Stephen’s retelling of Israel’s rejection of Moses as God’s appointed prophet and leader, which resulted in Israel’s paradigmatic moment of idolatry in the building of the golden calf.

59 As is true for each LXX-Book-of-the-Twelve quotation in Acts, the Greek source is that closest to the A-group (cf. e.g., Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 14–19; van de Sandt, “The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts,” 57–58). Additionally, in this section the names of the gods mentioned in this quotation will not gain much attention. In close continuity with the interpretation of LXX-Amos 5:26–27 in the previous section, we suggest that the names of the gods in the quotation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7 are not at all the focus of the Lukan Stephen (cf. Dines, “Amos,” 165–69), and it does not appear that Luke wants to change much about these named idols, but to read them as they stand in his Greek text. In fact, one other scholar (Gian Luigi Prato, “Idolatry Compelled to Search for Its Gods: A Peculiar Agreement Between Textual Tradition and Exegesis (Amos 5:25–27 and Acts 7:42–43),” in *Luke and Acts*, ed. Gerald O’Collins, Gilberto Marconi, Matthew J. O’Connell, and Emilio Rasco [New York: Paulist Press, 1991], 196) calls these gods, “illusory divine beings that not only have never existed *in mente Dei* ... but have never had any kind of solid existence *in mente textus*.” While this conclusion may be more extreme than my stance, it demonstrates an important point, namely, the debate around the identity of these gods is misguided, and it takes the focus finding what the main point the Lukan Stephen had in mind. Much like the golden calf, Dines’ assessment of the Greek text of Amos is helpful, that these gods are simply, but importantly, “prototypes” of gods (“Amos,” 169), and it should be added that these are gods that would guide the future of idolatry in Israel, as the calf did.

The quotation moves into the temple polemic by connecting to God's provision to Moses of a pattern or type for a place of worship, the tent of witness that will move with his people.

In this instance, Luke uses an interpretive technique similar to *gezerah shawah* when he quotes LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43.⁶⁰ He imbeds this quotation into Stephen's historical polemic with many linking terms. The most significant of these terms include: "the tent (τὴν σκηνὴν) of Moloch" in 7:43 to "the tent (ἡ σκηνή) of witness" in 7:44; "the images (τοὺς τύπους) that you made" in 7:43 to "according to the image (τὸν τύπον) that he had seen"; and "the works of their hands" (τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν) in 7:41 and "made by human hands" (χειροποιήτοις) in 7:48 to "that you made (οὓς ἐποίησατε) to worship" in 7:43. Also, more broadly, "the hosts of heaven" in 7:42 relates thematically to "the star of your god Rephan" in 7:43.⁶¹

The purpose for this section on the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 5 is to demonstrate that Stephen is, in fact, responding to the three charges⁶² leveled against him, and in doing so, he uses LXX-Amos 5:25–27 as an analogy of typology between eras that clarifies his reversal of the charges against his accusers. In other words, LXX-Amos is central to the three types which the Lukan Stephen lays out in his words against the Jewish leaders.

In each of the three patterns or types explored below, the same pattern will be revealed and clarified by Stephen's rhetorical appropriation of the LXX-Amos 5:25–27. Reading this text in light of its normative authority, Luke ties in strong themes of idolatry and a contrast between the Lord's types and Israel's, "the good" versus "the bad," as seen in the normative text. Now we will explore each type in order to demonstrate how it reverses the charges placed on Stephen, and probably more important to our case, how it relates to the analogy set by the quotation.

60 Longenecker (*Exegesis*, 20) helpfully explains that this technique is the "verbal analogy from one verse to another ... [is] applied to separate cases, [whereby] it follows that the same considerations apply to both."

61 Cf. e.g., Johnson, *Acts*, 132; Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 1405–6.

62 Acts 6:11–14 say those charges are: [1] that he speaks against Moses and God (6:11); [2] that he speaks against the law/customs of Moses; [3] that he speaks against "this holy place" (the Temple); according to the latter two charges, the accusation is that Jesus would destroy the temple and change the customs of Moses (6:13b–14).

III.C "A Prophet Like Me": the Charge of Rejecting God and Moses⁶³

Between 7:35–39, the "prophet like me" typology emerges as the first pattern in the Lukan Stephen's speech.⁶⁴ According to this pattern, by further clarifying that Jesus is the anti-type of "the prophet like me" from Deut. 18:18, Stephen reverses the accusation that he rejects Moses as God's ideal prophet.⁶⁵ This pattern rests heavily upon previous verbal patterns seen in the Lukan Peter's earlier speeches in Acts 2 and 3.⁶⁶ Among other verbal parallels, Luke echoes language used earlier about Jesus to parallel Moses here in Acts 7 both "raising"⁶⁷ and "this Jesus"⁶⁸ language from Acts 2, as well as in

- 63 It is important to note one thing: Luke's Moses/Jesus typology should be distinguished from other early Christian examples. Specifically, in mind is Heb. 3:1–6. Unlike, Hebrews, Luke is not attempting to say that Jesus is a greater Moses. A contrast between the two has no place in Luke's interpretation. Rather, he is interested showing their strict analogy (Haenchen, *Acts*, 288–89). The explicit parallel makes the Lukan Stephen's indictment and rebuttal of his accusers in 7:39–44 stronger, and the charge which the Lukan Stephen's rebuts (namely, the charge of "speaking against Moses") in 6:11 weaker, and in fact reversed upon the accusers. For Luke, Israel's treatment of Moses as the Lord's prophet and "in-flesh" representative is ultimately demonstrated in their paradigmatic rejection of Moses, and presently the murder of "the Righteous One," the anti-type of "the prophet like me"; both affirmed by the Lord (cf. Acts 2:22; 3:14, 22–23). In the end, this typology shows that the Jews have in fact rejected Moses and God (contra 6:11), and this is made clear, according to Stephen, by how they have rejected the Righteous One, and the one who appointed him, or the Lukan Stephen, the Lord has in Israel's history granted Israel his direct access to himself via a prophet (7:37–38). The Lord, through Stephen's "history of Israel" has "provided" or made "provision" of men to lead. Moses and Jesus, however, are provisions of their own particular type that are in fact provisions of the Lord's direct presence with his people.
- 64 This typology is generally known and recognized in scholarship. Cf. e.g., Tannehill, *Acts*, 91; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 240; John J Kilgallen, *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7*, 2–53 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 97; Gaventa, *Acts*, 124–28; Dunn, *Acts*, 94–95; Haenchen, *Acts*, 282–83, with most commentators.
- 65 The use of "wonders and signs" by the Lukan Stephen in 7:36, as God's attestation of his appointment of Moses, likewise alludes to his attestation of Jesus in 2:22. Despite this, the Jews viewed Jesus as one deserving "crucifixion and death." However, God testifies that Jesus is instead "LORD and Christ" (2:36). In a similar way to God's authentication of Moses in Acts 7:36, Jesus is authenticated by God (2:22) and rejected by Israel in Acts 2:23 and again later in 7:52 (cf. 2:22; and Jesus' followers, Acts 2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 14:3; 15:12).
- 66 Johnson, *Acts*, 119; Via, "An Interpretation," 218.
- 67 In 7:37, Moses says that the Lord will "raise up for you a prophet like me ..." First, the language of "raising up" is likely an allusion to Acts 2:24, where the Lukan Peter indicates God, himself, raised Jesus up to be Lord and Christ, which ultimately, for the Lukan Peter authenticated his identity (cf. 2:36).
- 68 Cf. for Moses, 7:35, 36, 37, 38. A similar parallel to Israel distancing themselves from Moses is found in LXX-Exodus. In LXX-Ex. 32:23, the conspiring Israelites refer to Moses as "this

Peter's Acts 3 speech that makes Luke's clearest case for Jesus being identified with the "prophet like me." This pattern illustrates God's choice of Moses as the ideal prophet (Deut. 18:15, 18), Jesus as the fulfillment of this ideal prophet role of "the prophet like me," and Israel's pattern of corporate rejection of God's appointed prophets (cf. Acts 7:52).

The Lukan Stephen's story of God's provision of an ideal prophet and Israel's rejection of this prophet is centralized in the five "this Moses" statements in 7:35–38. At the heart of Stephen's reversal of the Jewish charge that, as God raised up an ideal prophet in Moses, God does the same in Jesus. But as with Israel's rejection of Moses and adoption of the calf,⁶⁹ the leaders of Israel now reject the Lord and Messiah, "the prophet like me," "The Righteous One" (cf. τοῦ δικαίου, Acts 7:52), who is Jesus, who is the Lord (though latently in this speech).⁷⁰

In summary, Jesus' fulfillment of this type and of this prophecy, makes this allusion potent and explicitly names Israel as the guilty party. Without a doubt, it is a serious charge against Israel's elect status (cf. 3:23). For Stephen, those who do not "obey" (cf. ὑπακούος) "the prophet like me" prophecy" as 7:39 says Israel refuses to do, are those who end up "resisting" (cf. ἀντιπύτω, 7:51) God himself via his Holy Spirit. Jervell correctly observes the literary decisions made by Luke in Acts 7, saying, "Just as Israel behaves against Moses, they also turned against Jesus. The parallelism is deliberately selected."⁷¹

III.d "Receiving Living Oracles": the Charge of Rejecting the Customs of Moses

The second pattern appealed to by the Lukan Stephen is the comparison of the Lord's provision of his living oracles or the law in Moses' time and of the Holy

Moses" (ὁ γὰρ Μωυσῆς οὗτος, cf. also 32:1). Johnson, *Acts*, 27; Keener, *Acts*: 3:1–14:28, 1400. Cf. also Acts 1:11; 2:36; 9:22; 17:3, for "this Jesus." See Haenchen on the divinity associated with this phrase in *Acts*, 282n3.

69 In 7:35, Stephen refers to Moses as "this Moses whom [Israel] rejected" (Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἡρνήσαντο), and continues to start each sentence with this phrase, and finally the last "this Moses" is in reference to the adoption of the golden calf in the place of the Lord.

70 Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, Luke uses the adjective "righteous" (δικαίος), and similar noun (ὁ δίκαιος) to indicate he is speaking about Jesus (cf. e.g., Lk 23:47, δίκαιος ἦν). Cf. Ruppert von Lothar, *Jesus Als der Leidende Gerechte. Der Weg Jesu Im Lichte Eines Alt- und Zwischentestamentlichen Motivs* (Stuttgart: KBW-Verlag, 1972); van de Sandt, "A Reflection," 53n51.

71 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 239. My translation. With Turner (*Power*, 311), who with similar emphasis says, "the prophet-like-Moses Christology has thus provided the linchpin of Luke's ecclesiology ... and suggests that there is now no longer any 'true' Israel where the claims of the Gospel are rejected."

Spirit in the day of the Lord. This pattern reverses the charge of Stephen's accusers, demonstrating that it is they who reject "the law" or "the customs that Moses delivered to us" (6:13–14). By providing the "living oracles," the Lord has given Israel a law whereby life can be mediated by Moses.⁷² Stephen's case is that they have rejected the life-giving law, and just as they have refused this law, they now reject the empowering life-giving Holy Spirit.⁷³

At the heart of this particular pattern is the rejection of Jesus as the Righteous One. Jesus is the law-giver in this pattern and the one rejected as "Spirit-giver" as the Lord was rejected as the divine "law-giver." Jervell rightly observes that "The Moses-Jesus typology cannot be confined to the prophetic [as discussed above], because ... Moses is not only a prophet, but rather, more precisely, also law-giver."⁷⁴ God has provided Jesus as his mediator of the law by virtue of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. This is seen in how the pattern points to Israel's rejection of God's divinely appointed law-giver at a time which they (Israel) believed to be an ideal era of the Exodus and a similar rejection in their current day.⁷⁵ For the Lukan Stephen, Israel's resistance to the Holy Spirit in 7:51 has its roots in the rejection of the living oracles handed down to Moses from the Lord in the Exodus.

As Jervell observes, both Jesus and Moses, for Luke, are portrayed as law-givers. This is first made evident by both figures being raised up for this task. In Acts 2, Jesus is raised up in fulfillment of God's prophecies through David (cf. Acts 2:24–36). He is raised up in spite of Israel's rejection and execution of him (2:24; 3:14) and is subsequently raised to the right hand of God for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (2:33, 38). Acts 7 clarifies the analogy between Moses and Jesus as prophets raised up by God for the dispensing of his living oracles.⁷⁶ As Jesus was raised up (2:24) to receive (2:33) and give the Holy Spirit (2:33), Moses likewise was raised up by God for the role of receiving living oracles "to give to [Israel]" (7:38). The student of Acts finds out that Moses had predicted this role for Jesus, according to the Lukan Stephen (7:37).⁷⁷

Moses as prophet was both figuratively raised up to the role of a prophet (Deut. 18:5; Acts 7:37) but was also literally raised up on Sinai for this task (7:38). A majority recognizes the echoes of Sinai in Jesus' Pentecost outpouring

72 Cf. Dunn, *Acts*, 95; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 380.

73 Turner, *Power*, 335. On the Lukan conception of the Spirit as an empowering and life-giving agent, cf. e.g., Lk. 1:35, 41; 2:25, 27; 3:16; 10:21; 11:13; 12:12; Acts 1:5, 8, 16; 2:4, 17, 18, 33, 38; 4:8, etc.

74 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 240. My translation.

75 Cf. Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 1419.

76 Via, "An Interpretation," 218.

77 Via, "An Interpretation," 218.

of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁸ But in view of Luke's development of the plot of Acts, such an early observation of this analogy could be charged with begging the question and in fact is most relevant now in Acts 7.⁷⁹

In the Lukan Stephen's speech, Luke explicitly reveals the importance of God's raising up of a law-giver and provision of the law, the historic Israelite rejection of these things (7:39), and the relation to the Holy Spirit. Stephen's final charge in 7:51–53 assumes that the student of Acts is drawing together the literary motifs that bring the plot to this point, with Acts 2 and 3 being firmly in mind for the pattern to be clear when referenced in 7:38–39.⁸⁰

Finally, the rejection of the divinely provided oracles and their mediator says volumes for the Lukan Stephen about Israel's elect status. According to an "ideal" point in history, they reject the law of the Lord (his very words in 7:53), but this also continues in their present day. Barrett rightly observes Israel's rejection of Moses and Jesus in their prophetic identities, saying,

Stephen claims that his hearers are, as their ancestors have been, stubborn and disobedient, as good as (uncircumcised) heathen, not in their flesh but in their readiness to hear and accept God's word.⁸¹

78 Turner (*Power*, 279–89) observes that a "secure case" for echoes of Sinai can be detected, contra Bock (*Proclamation*, 182–83), Strauss (*The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995], 145–47) and O'Toole ("Davidic Covenant," *passim*); Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 31–35. O'Toole, ("Davidic Covenant," 250) rightly places the emphasis of Acts 2 on the fulfillment of the Davidic Covenant in Jesus being proclaimed "LORD and Christ." However, he unfortunately (with Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, cf. esp. 37) sees little connection between the use of Joel 3:1–5 and the Davidic prophecies, and as Turner (*Power*, 286) implies, O'Toole may overplay his claim.

79 Max Turner (cf. *Power*, 285–86) makes the most plausible case for Sinai echoes in Acts 2. In three places, Turner's case is compelling, namely, (1) three-thousand fell to the sword of the Levites in Ex. 32:28), and three-thousand repented at Pentecost (Acts 2:41); (2) Moses' prophecy in Num. 11:29 that all God's people would receive the spirit of prophecy appears fulfilled in Acts 2 (cf. 2:6, 38); (3) Turner appeals to Josephus to draw a parallel between "the gift" of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2 and where Josephus says that Moses would "soon return to give 'a gift'" (*AJ*. 3.77–78). These parallels shown by Turner are the most convincing put forth by him, but Sinai combined with a Moses/Jesus likeness is not articulated by Luke until Acts 7. Luke needs to be given priority in authorial intention (an aspect surely Turner would not deny), which means that it is best to observe the Sinai motif only now in Acts 7.

80 Johnson, *Acts*, 119.

81 Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 376.

The oracles, for Israel, were the ethical code that marked Israel out as a people and gave them life.⁸² However, their rejection of God's provision of this code of ethics is their rejection of what made them unique, differentiates them from the nations, and shows their allegiance to the Lord alone.⁸³ Pressed to its logical end, the resistance, first to the living oracles, and now the resistance to the Holy Spirit, is a clear rejection of the Lord himself.

According to 7:51–53, Israel's rejection of the Spirit fundamentally characterizes how they have followed the law, how they treated the interpreters of the law (cf. τῶν προφητῶν, 7:52), and how they received or rejected God's appointed "law giver." Barrett goes to the heart of the matter, saying, "According to Stephen, the history of Israel consists of messages (living oracles, v. 38) addressed by God to his people, and his people's disobedience and recalcitrance."⁸⁴ Vis-a-vis such resistance, Israel refuses the promised Spirit that removes the Lord's judgment, gives life, and signifies the reception of God's "prophet like me," Jesus the anointed Lord (cf. 2:36–38).

In light of the second charge of speaking against the customs of Moses and the law, Stephen claims to stand on the side of the angels (cf. 7:35, 38, 53). Dunn agrees, saying "there is no critique of Moses here, nor rejection of his law; on the contrary, a bid is being clearly made that the speaker is in closer continuity with Moses than his hearers ..." ⁸⁵ Stephen effectively reverses the charge upon his accusers saying that he and the church he speaks for do not follow customs but living oracles provided by the Lord himself, a living code which Israel, in a predictable pattern, continues to resist (7:51). For the Lukan Stephen, therefore, those who follow Jesus represent the true law-followers. As Jervell says, "They who have the Spirit, keep the law ... The church consists of people 'zealous for the law' (Acts 21:21) ... There is harmony between the Spirit and law."⁸⁶

III.e *"Rejoicing in the Works of Their Hands": the Charge of Rejecting the Temple*

The final pattern to be covered is the reversal of the final charge against Stephen, et al., who is accused of speaking against "this holy place," the temple in Jerusalem. This final "type" of Stephen's three types in response to his accusers is the one that draws the previous two together into a complete and unified response. Like the previous two, this one likens the era of the Exodus

82 Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 380.

83 Cf. John J Kilgallen, *Stephen's Speech*, 84.

84 Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 376.

85 Dunn, *Acts*, 95.

86 Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 53–54.

to the context in Acts 7 via the quotation of LXX-Amos 5, but unlike the previous two, this one is closely tied to the Amos quotation verbally, thus stitching together the three types, the two eras, and one cogent argument with Amos at the center.

With this third type, Stephen demonstrates a pattern of Israel rejecting God's chosen way of meeting his people and being present among them in favor of something made by human hands. Fundamentally he does this by likening the paradigmatic idolatry of Israel's golden period in worshipping the golden calf to the ultimate symbol of national pride in the temple in Jerusalem, still presently standing in Stephen's day. For the Lukan Stephen, Israel's attitude towards the temple fundamentally defines whom they view God to be, which leads to idolatry and reveals a callousness and resistance to the way in which God has chosen, finally, to move throughout the world by the gospel message in the Righteous One.⁸⁷

It has been a temptation in past Lukan scholarship to read Stephen's temple polemic at face value. This view typically results in making Luke say that a specific locale, the temple, is to blame for Israel's resistance to the Lord. The proper understanding of the LXX-Amos quotation works against this trend.

For some, Stephen's words have been against the temple in itself. The quotation below of Kilgallen is a prime example of this. He believes that at 7:47 the mention of Solomon's construction of an οἶκος for God, is the turning point for the Lukan Stephen's criticism of the temple. He suggests that one should see the temple as integrally contrary to the tabernacle given to Moses in 7:44, saying, "How out of step are the vv 47–50 with those previous vv 46–44 [sic]"⁸⁸. He latches onto verbiage that characterizes a location of worship and suggests one to be approved by God, according to Stephen, and the other one to lack such approval; the tent is to be completely God-approved while the temple as a place of worship is to be disapproved by God.⁸⁹

Kilgallen submits that 7:44–50 interprets the tabernacle as having God's approval, yet the temple as lacking such approval. Kilgallen notes,

In v 44 there was a sign of God's approbation for what Moses built for the desert fathers. In v 46 there is likewise God's approbation for what David found. But v 47, though recounting Solomon's building a house, gives no approbation of it by God. Indeed, one easily sees that vv 48–50 shows just

⁸⁷ Jervell, *Theology*, 20.

⁸⁸ John J Kilgallen, *Stephen's Speech*, 89.

⁸⁹ John J Kilgallen, *Stephen's Speech*, 89.

the opposite of divine approbation. Verses 49–50 leave no doubt about the divine dissatisfaction with the *oikos* built by Solomon.⁹⁰

He visually represents his argument as follows:

44	skēnē	Moses	approved
45	skēnē	Patres	approved
46	skēnōma	David	approved
47	oikos	Solomon	
48–50			disapproved

For Kilgallen, Stephen is making a statement about the structure which Solomon built contradicts worship of the one true God, and how this disapproved worship site continues into Stephen's present day in the temple in Jerusalem. But we contend that Kilgallen's analysis is flawed from the beginning according to what he believes Stephen's guiding question to be. That is, as demonstrated in the previous two patterns, Stephen's guiding question has not concerned specific locations of worship or such passing things. Instead, the question for Stephen has concerned Israel's pattern of turning away from the Lord for their type (τύπος; 7:43, 44) despite the ways he has made himself present among his people. It is important to note that Kilgallen does not appeal to the lengthy history that Stephen recites as the context for the temple polemic. The connection, however, is integral to his polemic and pattern.

Instead, the analysis of this passage should follow the Lukan focus, which is upon the attitude of Israel toward the temple. There is a pattern in Stephen's history of Israel that makes clear that the heart of Israel has tended to be wayward from God and marked by idolatry. Israel's heart towards the temple is no different, and it has led them to reject the Righteous One. The Lord has been rejected throughout their history, as Stephen tells the story, and the current rejection of Jesus for the temple system and what it represents to them is simply the latest episode—though an important episode.

For Stephen's temple polemic, the heart of Israel's rejection for some other option is not found in the verbal difference between the temple and the tent of witness, but in 7:48 when Stephen prefaces the Is. 66 quotation with ἀλλ' at 7:48. The Lukan Stephen says ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ, followed by a corroborating quotation from Isaiah 66:1–2. Stephen's turn at 7:48 with ἀλλ' is indicating that Israel's attitude toward the temple has become perverted from its original intention. The type given to Moses in 7:44, in order to

90 John J Kilgallen, *Stephen's Speech*, 89.

“dispossess the nations” by God’s plan, has not been exchanged for a temple that is perverted by a wrong and wayward attitude attached to it that leaves no room for the Lord and his plan.

A pattern of “hand-made-ness” is how Stephen illustrates Israel’s pattern of rejection of the Lord for their own type, which ultimately makes them idolaters. Both the calf, in what is supposed to be Israel’s ideal past, and the current (to Stephen) temple is associated with and described by the language of “made by hands.” Israel’s rejection of God’s chosen place of presence, and ultimately the way in which God is viewed to be present in that place, has its roots in a pattern beginning in the Exodus. Israel’s rejection of Moses was accompanied by an idolatrous rejection of the tent of witness that God directed Moses to make “according to the pattern that he had seen [on Sinai]” (cf. 7:40, 44).⁹¹ Instead, Israel rejected God’s pattern and directed their heart towards the calf they made with their own hands (7:40–41; *μοσχοποιέω*, literally, “they engaged in calf making,” presumably with their hands⁹²).⁹³

Israel’s worship of the calf is revealing, according to Stephen, since Israel is inclined to direct their worship towards what their hands made. He says that when they had made the calf, the Israelites “were rejoicing in the works of their hands” (7:41). Luke’s words, “rejoicing in the works of their hands,” appear to be his interpretation of the Exodus’ words, “they stood up to play.”⁹⁴ Luke affirms this interpretation by saying they celebrated idolatry in 7:41. Israel’s worship betrays that the works of their hands is the focus of their idolatrous worship.

With a strong verbal connection, the hand-made-ness connects the calf episode of 7:40–42 to the idolatry in the quotation of Amos 5:25–27. Moloch and Rephan are said to be “made [by Israel] to worship” (7:43, οὓς ἐποίησατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς). But as we are proposing in this section of our study, the quotation is not part of the chronology of Stephen’s historical polemic. Rather, by analogy, these prototypical idols, as we have seen them earlier in the LXX-Amos text itself, tie together Israel’s formative past to their present in a poignant continuity. As Keener helpfully observes, “When Stephen mentions the idolatrous ‘works of their hands’ (Acts 7:41) ... he is already thinking ahead to 7:48 ...”⁹⁵

91 Cf. Dunn, *Acts*, 96–97.

92 This is the only occurrence of *μοσχοποιέω* in Christian literature (so, BDAG), constructed by combining *μόσχος* and *ποιέω*.

93 Cf. Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 145.

94 See the excursus below and specifically the portion on Exodus 32 for more on the phrase “they stood up to play” and its relation to a perversion of the prescribed way to worship God.

95 Keener, *Acts*: 3:1–14:28, 1405. Cf. Dunn, *Acts*, 96.

The LXX-Amos 5 quotation ties one stage of Stephen's polemic to another by comparing the way the places of worship were made and by whom they were created, and by the use of ὁ τύπος in 7:44 (τοὺς τύπους, 7:43; τὸν τύπον, 7:44). Following the quotation in Acts 7:44, Stephen returns to Moses and his role as mediator of the pattern for the tent of witness. The verbal tie found in the LXX quotation of τύπος that weds the Exodus era to the present polemic upon the temple creates, for Stephen, a typology of worship. The question posed by this typology is, "Who created it? The Lord? Or man?" Both the prototypical idols of the LXX-Amos quotation and the tent of witness are called "types," but it is who made the "type" that matters here.

For Stephen, this typology of worship brings to the surface two analogous idols, both associated with the human-hand-made-ness of the two objects.⁹⁶ Like the calf in 7:41 (cf. ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, 7:41), the temple is said to be χειροποίητος, in 7:48. Jewish literature demonstrates that Stephen's message of idolatry would not have fallen on deaf ears. In the LXX-corpus, χειροποίητος is frequently used in reference to "the foolishness of worshipping what humans create"⁹⁷ (e.g., Lev 26:1, 30; cf. also, Isa. 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 19:1; 21:9; 31:7; 46:6; Dan. 5:4, 23). Other Jewish writings attest to the same (cf. e.g., Philo, Mos. 1.303; Sib. Or. 3.606, 618, 722–23).⁹⁸

For Stephen, the implication is that the temple has undoubtedly become as much of an idol as the calf once was and stands for a fundamental turn from the Lord. In both cases, Israel's rejection and creation by their own hands of a new worship place by their hands is a rejection of the Lord and his chosen pattern of his presence. Two types are presented, but Israel rejects the Lord's for their own.

For Israel in the Exodus and Israel in Stephen's day, the creation of their own type is at its heart a rejection of God's relationship with them as a people. The temple as a locale in Jerusalem, contrary to Kilgallen, is not what is wrong; it is Israel's heart. Stephen by an analogy created by his appropriation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 demonstrates a pattern of heart-waywardness with the paradigmatic golden calf idolatry and with its application to the present heart towards the temple. It is as Keener says, "The danger of idolatry in the wilderness, signaled by Amos, [is transferred by Luke] to the Jerusalem temple.... [for the Lukan Stephen] his accusers have made an idol of it."⁹⁹ The temple is not

96 Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 145.

97 Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 1405.

98 Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 1405.

99 Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 1411.

idolatrous in and of itself, it is how the type has been applied to it. It is just the latest thing to draw Israel from their Lord.

It is Israel's heart-attitude that is at the core of the temple polemic. This reveals Israel's view of the Lord and Stephen's reversal of the accusation against him that he is not following God's plan. Associated with the calf, Acts 7:39 says of Israel that "their hearts turned." And in association with the temple polemic, 7:51 says that Israel is "uncircumcised in heart ..." Luke links the idolatrous heart of the Exodus community in building the calf with the current state of the Jewish heart towards Jesus in Acts 7. The attitude toward the temple is like that of the calf idolatry. God is said to remove his presence over the calf idolatry by "turning" (7:42, ἐστρεψεν δὲ ὁ θεός). Turner rightly suggests that this enduring attitude towards the Lord is reflected in Stephen's reference in 7:51 to the uncircumcised hearts of his audience who are resisting the Holy Spirit (cf. 7:39, καὶ ἐστράφησαν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον).¹⁰⁰ By his quotation of Isaiah 66:1–2, Stephen summarizes Solomon's pronouncement in 2 Chron. 6:18 upon the completion of the first temple, namely, "But will God indeed dwell with man on the earth? Behold the skies and the highest heaven cannot contain you, how much less this house that I have built!" (cf. 2 Chron. 2:6). Like the calf and ἡ σκηνή τοῦ Μόλοχ in the quotation of LXX-Amos 5:26, the tabernacle of Acts 7:44 would have been built by human hands. However, it is how Israel conceives of the temple and who lays the plans (i.e., Israel as in 7:43 or the Lord as in 7:44, according to types) that makes the temple most like the idols. The Jews of Stephen's day are the creator of a designated space for God's presence and the ones who maintain that dwelling, as Israel was in the Exodus period and following for the idols.

As we have seen in this final rebuttal thus far, Israel is guilty of "hand-making" a distinct "type" that is not from the Lord. Despite his accusers, Stephen declares that the way his fellow countrymen regard the temple in Jerusalem is downright idolatry and that they speak against the Lord (which is much worse than "speaking against this holy place"). Israel rejects the Lord as the creator and the one who gave directly to Moses the true "type" for the place where he would meet with Israel. They reject him as the one who moves freely about the world based upon his sovereign mission as that type in 7:44 was meant to do,

100 Turner, *Power*, 335. Marcus Barth makes a similar point in reference to Paul's statements on the dwelling of God in Eph. 2:19, saying, "While Paul reminds his readers of God's promised presence, he does not suggest that they should pretend to possess and manage it. The church is 'to be the dwelling place of God in the Spirit'" (*Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1–3* [Garden City: Doubleday, 1974], 324).

and they have thus now become idolaters.¹⁰¹ Jervell summarizes the crux of the issue well, saying,

Consequently the sin is idolatry, that is, denial of the law and its first commandment (Acts 7:40–43). The outcome of such a denial was the setting up of the golden calf in the desert, so that even Israel, in a central period of its history, turned out to be idolatrous ... [Luke views] idolatry as ignorance, what happens when you do not recognize God as creator. Then all idols are only products of human hands (7:38ff; 17:29; 19:26), and so nothing but follies (14:14–18).¹⁰²

According to Stephen, Israel's attitude towards the temple betrays a heart that holds to the pattern of rejection of a God who creates and moves about freely. They have made the temple a shrine for an idol, like the altar to the calf. This pattern dethrones God from his sovereign position as Lord of his people.

Furthermore, it effectively tethers him to Jerusalem as a local deity rather than a Lord that who has universal reign. And the "fixed-ness" of the temple leads to Israel's error. As a fixed location the temple came to be viewed as where God was enshrined, for all intents and purposes (contra 2 Chron. 2:6). But this mindset is refuted by Stephen's appeal to Is. 66:1–2 and the fact that the temple is designated as a dwelling place for the House of Jacob (7:46).¹⁰³ God is not possessed by Israel and their agenda nor housed by them. Israel is the Lord's and the provision of space created by the Lord is for them to dwell in to meet him and not vice versa. As Jervell says, "The temple is not a house for God, but a house for the people, a place to keep the law, only a temporary place for worship."¹⁰⁴

Israel's heart toward a fixed temple has effectively nationalized God and contained him in one spot for others to visit. This has effectively derailed his mission via Israel as his people reaching other nations. Such a fact is contrary to the narrative Luke is telling about how God is the one who visits his people as discussed already through Jesus' ministry and the Holy Spirit in the apostles' ministry. But also it is contrary to what the Lord says about himself in Acts 7 when he gave the pattern of the tent of witness to Moses, a place where God

101 Cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 299; Keener, *Acts*: 3:7–14:28, 1405.

102 Jervell, *Theology*, 20.

103 Some MSS have θεῶν in 7:46 instead of οἴκου, resulting in "a dwelling place for the God of Jacob" (cf. e.g., ESV) instead of "a dwelling place for the house of Jacob" (cf. e.g., RSV). The latter is preferred in light of the data from above and in light of Stephen's overall argument.

104 Jervell, *Theology*, 21. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 382.

would appear to his people (cf. e.g., Ex 33:7–11) and move about the nations. Acts 7:45 says, God's original provision of the σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου was designed to move with Israel among the disobedient nations and possess more land that would be the Lord's (cf. 7:45, ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν). According to this "type" given by the Lord, Israel did so by moving about the earth. Such movement, like that forecasted in Acts 1:8, demonstrated the mobility of their worship of the Lord among the nations but also demonstrating the claim that the Lord has and his mission had upon the whole earth. With the briefly noted conquest under Joshua (a probable rhetorical play on words between "Jesus," and "Joshua"),¹⁰⁵ there are echoes back to the worldwide mission of Jesus given earlier in Acts 1:6–8 in that the church is now called to spread among the nations of the world. Regrettably, Israel has become that "disobedient nation" they once dispossessed who is not "on the move."¹⁰⁶

There is a strong contrast between the temple and the types of worship Israel makes in the calf and the prototypical idols in 7:42–44 with the type given by the Lord in 7:44 by virtue of its movement. Chance says it best,

What is to be noted here is the fact that Luke does not view the tabernacle of 7:44 as synonymous with the temple of Solomon. The tabernacle symbolizes a view of God who is on the move in the world; the 'house' points to a view of God who is confined and stationary. They are not the same image of God, and, hence, the tabernacle does not equate with the temple.¹⁰⁷

Chance is right that the confined and stationary character of the temple is key. It easily led Israel back into a pattern of idolatry, analogous to the calf that limited their view of God's purposes in the world.¹⁰⁸

Israel's nationalistic tendency, and the temple as its national symbol becomes a key connection as Luke moves through his narrative. Israel's national concern and defensiveness over their customs make them fundamentally resistant to God's work in Jesus and, later in Acts, to a mission to Gentiles qua Gentiles.¹⁰⁹ The implication can be drawn from Stephen's speech, in application

¹⁰⁵ Keener, *Acts*: 3:1–14:28, 1413–14.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Keener, *Acts*: 3:1–14:28, 1414.

¹⁰⁷ Chance, *The Temple*, 40–41. With Haenchen, *Acts*, 285.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 383–84.

¹⁰⁹ van de Sandt, "A Reflection," 38. van de Sandt correctly goes on in an adjoining footnote to this sentence to say that this statement is also affirmed by "Luke's rendering of the quotation from Joel 3,1–5 LXX in Acts 2,17–21." Specifically he says, "The last clause Luke cites

to the broader Lukan narrative, that with the movement of the message of salvation in Jesus, God's people again dispossess the nations to the Lord's possession as in the conquest noted in 7:45, but under Jesus' reign the possession comes by way of the gospel. However, Israel's heart toward the preservation of their national symbol, and therefore their national identity, has led them to idolatry, an impotent witness to the world, and a view of God that is like an idol at their disposal and possessed by a single nation. Jervell puts it strongly, saying, "The seriousness and central place of [the sin of idolatry] is seen in the fact that no mission takes place among the heathens, as the history of the Gentiles is the history of idolatry."¹¹⁰

In summary, Stephen takes on and reverses the third accusation that was made against him and the other followers of Jesus; namely, that they reject the temple. Stephen's characterization of Israel's heart towards the temple follows a pattern or type, like the previous two, namely, the Lord provides a type and Israel rejects that type for something different. As Fitzmyer paraphrases Stephen's words, "You preferred a structure made by human hands to what God had given you [by Moses]."¹¹¹ In the end, Kilgallen and others like him correctly notice a distinction between the tent of witness and the temple. But contrary to the conclusions of Kilgallen, et al., Stephen's argument is not against a place¹¹² but against a pattern of Israelite history that has a bearing on the idolatrous heart of his fellow countrymen in his present day. If the interpretive analogy from LXX-Amos 5:25–27 holds, Stephen's argument is that it is not the early Christians who reject "this holy place," but the Jewish leaders who reject it by rejecting God's provision now of the Righteous One and the type of universal mission he has for his people (cf. Acts 1:8). As Fitzmyer observes, "[In rejecting Jesus] the religious authorities who challenge [Stephen] are no better than the stiff-necked [cf. 7:51] Israelites who demanded of Aaron the golden calf for their idolatry."¹¹³

from this passage is: 'And it shall be that whoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (Joel 3,5a). Luke breaks off his quotation exactly before Jerusalem and Zion are mentioned as the place of salvation ..." (see note 29).

110 Jervell, *Theology*, 20.

111 Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 383–84.

112 E.g., Heanichen (*Acts*, 290) says here in Acts 7 that Luke has put in the mouth of Stephen an "anti-Jewish diatribe." Rather, as Keener (*Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 1424) alludes to, Stephen's accusation is not anti-Jewish, but anti-hardheartedness.

113 Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 383–84.

III.f *Summary: the Reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43*

Contrary to a stream of Lukan scholarship,¹¹⁴ Stephen not only answers his accusers' point by point, but he reverses the charges upon them. The Jewish leaders, not Stephen, are guilty of rejecting Moses and God and the customs and place of God's presence for which God used Moses to mediate to his people. Stephen demonstrates this by his rhetorical appeal to LXX-Amos 5:25–27 and the literal connection of three different types it makes.

Contrary to hermeneutical methods of reading the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 that seek overly literal historical or literary chronology, we have seen that it is used rhetorically to undergird the point that Stephen makes by three typologies. Working in concentric circles from the outside in, we have observed that by three Moses-Jesus typologies (as a prophet, as a law giver, and as a worship type) that Israel has habitually through the ages missed the point. Stephen's charge is that Israel's heart is wayward even though they believe it to be in the right place, and their ears are deaf to correction even when met in person by the Lord himself. Moving forward in Luke's story, such rejection of Jesus is bound to have significant ecclesiological ramifications. But for now, the mission is that which will see changes. Stephen's words result in his stoning and the scattering of the early Christians from Jerusalem at the hands of a young man named Saul who will be at the center of our conversation vis-a-vis the next LXX-TP prophecy and what it has to say about the changing face of ecclesiology under Jesus' lordship. Rather than being a wrong-headed or illogical quotation of Scripture, LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7 holds a central place in the unfolding of the mission and face of the earliest church according to Luke by tying together two important eras: an era that is supposed to be a golden one and the present day, both marked by idolatry that draws Israel from her Lord.

IV *Amos in the Damascus Document: CD-A 7:13–8:1*

Now we will take up an interlocutor for Luke, who is reading the same text as he is and inquire into how that author interpreted the same writings for the distinct purposes of their community.

CD-A 7:13–8:1a appropriates Amos 5:25–27 with a midrashic interpretive model.¹¹⁵ CD-A contains a citation of Is. 7:17 that is followed by a midrash on

114 Cf. e.g., Lake and Cadbury, *Commentary*, 70; Haenchen, *Acts*, 287, 290; Beyer, *Apostelgeschichte*, 49.

115 The Damascus Document comes to us in two recensions known as A and B. At two points A and B parallel each other: 7:9–10a (A) is parallel to 19:5b–7a (B), and 8:1b–2 (A) is

Amos 5:26–27a which is elucidated by an allusion to Amos 9:1a and ends with an allusion to Numbers 24:17.¹¹⁶ The midrash on Amos 5:26–27a is located within a broader discussion of an imminent judgment of the “backsliders” (cf. 7:9–8:21, specifically 7:13–8:1).¹¹⁷ The particular issue at hand is the division between Ephraim and Judah, the two houses of Israel (cf. CD 56:9). In its most general form, the situation that CD looks to address by reading Amos 5 is a fracture between the sect CD represents and Jerusalem over correct law observance¹¹⁸ and deliverance from the disaster of lawlessness.¹¹⁹

In this section, we will explore the reading of Amos 5:26–27a in CD-A 7:13–8:1a for the context CD appropriates the normative text into its own context.

IV.a *The Reading of Amos 5:26–27a in CD-A 7:13–8:1a*¹²⁰

In CD-A 7:13–8:1a,¹²¹ the primary terminology, Sikkuth, Kiyyun, and Damascus, is key to understanding how this community appropriates Amos 5:26–27a as justification for separation from the Jerusalem Temple and helpfully guides the essential thrust behind this text. The text of CD puts forth these critical terms as integral to its meaning by first introducing them through its quotation of Amos 5 in CD-A 7:14–15 and then giving its midrash on Amos 5 through the

parallel to 19:13b–14 (B). The midrash on Amos 5:26–27a (and Amos 9:1a allusion) is found in CD-A, but not in B. For more, see J. Murphy-O'Connor, “The Original Text of CD 7:9–8:2 = 19:5–14,” *HTR* 64, no. 2–3 (1971): 379.

116 J. Murphy-O'Connor, “Original Text,” 379.

117 Gert Steyn, “Trajectories of Scripture Transmission: The Case of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43,” *HTS* 69, no. 1 (2013): 3.

118 Lawrence H Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 145. Schiffman’s final point on the meaning of Damascus is, however, still in question and not as sure as he makes it (for multiple views on this issue, cf. e.g., Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 266–67; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, “Damascus Document [CD and QD],” in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A Evans and Stanley E Porter [Downers Grove: IVP, 2000], 249).

119 Philip R. Davies, “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document,” *JJS* 33, no. 1–2 (1982): 298.

120 I am greatly indebted to Gert Steyn for this section. His study (“Trajectories”) of the reception of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43 explores, with a method strikingly similar to this present study, with clear logic, the appropriation of Amos 5:26–27a in CD-A 7.

121 We have intentionally set our focus on 7:13–8:1a, mainly because it is the section where the midrash on Amos 5:27 is located, and also this portion of CD naturally functions as an independent section, indicated primarily by the bracketing occurrences of “backslider” (cf. J. Murphy-O'Connor, “Original Text,” 288; George J. Brooke, “The Amos-Numbers Midrash [CD 7:13b–8:1a] and Messianic Expectation,” *ZAW* 92, no. 3 [1980]: passim) in 7:13 (לַחֲרֵב הַסִּגְרוֹ וְהַנְסוּגִים) and 8:1 (לַחֲרֵב הַסִּגְרוֹ וְהַנְסוּגִים). The repeated bracketing phrase literally says, “the backsliders were turned/handed over to the sword.”

meanings of these terms in the following six lines (7:15B–8:1a).¹²² Though the direct comparison between the reading and appropriation of Amos 5:25–27 in CD and in Acts 7 will happen below, it is important to note that where Luke may be seen as appropriating Amos 5 in a much more typological analogy to his context, the midrashic style of CD-A is more literal and workman-like, though also quite unsubstantiated in the connections it makes when using Amos. Similarly, Wolff correctly characterizes this section of CD “a step-by-step interpretation of Am 5:26[–27a].”¹²³

IV.a.1 The Tent as Your King

CD-A 7:14 says, “And I will expel the tabernacle of your king ...” This is a similar reading of the Hebrew vowels as the LXX¹²⁴ and Vulgate have it. All three change the divine title סִכּוּת (Sikkuth) to טֹבֶת (tabernacle¹²⁵). CD interprets “the tabernacle of the king” as the Book of the Law or the Torah. The “king” himself is said to be “the assembly.”

The essential change of Hebrew vocalization by the interpretation of CD allows for the connection between Amos 5:26–27a and the supporting allusion to Amos 9:11a. The “tabernacle (טֹבֶת) of the king” connects to the tabernacle of David in Amos 9:11a. CD-A 7:15b–16 says, “The books of the law are the tabernacle of the King, as he said, ‘I will lift up the fallen tabernacle of David.’”

122 Unlike Luke, the allusion to Amos 5:26–27a in CD-A 7:14–15 primarily follows the MT in its major terminology, and also its emphasis on exile: Sikkuth, Kiyyun, and Damascus. Steyn observes that between the MT-Amos 5:26–27 and the allusion of Amos 5:26–27a CD there are three major differences in the text form. That CD appears continuous verbally with the parts it quotes from the MT-Amos 5:26–27a does not tell the full story of how CD uses Amos. It is what CD does with these major terms in its midrash of Amos 5 that does, and is the interest of this section. The substitution of “beyond Damascus” with “beyond my tent to Damascus,” of the three differences, will have the most importance for understanding the interpretation of CD. See Steyn (“Trajectories,” 3) for the minor text changes. Cf., also, Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960), 13.

123 Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 267.

124 For “the tent of the king,” the LXX has an additional difference when it changes the vocalization of מֶלֶךְ (king) to מֹלֶךְ (Moloch), rendering the phrase τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολοχ.

125 Steyn is correct to note that טֹבֶת could mean either “tent,” “tabernacle,” or “hut,” but also in CD-A 7:15 the Hebrew term אוֹהֶל could also mean “tent” (“Trajectories,” 3); it is used to indicate the Temple, and the movement of the Davidic tabernacle and the books of the law and the prophets away from the Temple to Damascus in exile (i.e., מִמֶּלֶךְ מִדָּמֶשֶׂק). Therefore, the distinction for this section will be that “tent” indicate the Temple of the LORD (אוֹהֶל) in CD-A 7:15 and “tabernacle” (טֹבֶת) indicates the “tabernacle of David” in CD-A 7:15–16.

Instead of indicating the enduring nature of Israel's idolatrous heart as it does in Amos, CD uses the vowel change to make סכת connect with the סֶכֶת of David in Amos 9:11 the community's possession and enactment of the law. The interpretive method of CD is similar to the Rabbinic exegetical rule of Rabbi Hillel called *gezerah shawah*. The rule essentially builds an argument upon a verbal analogy between two biblical passages.¹²⁶ By this simple interpretive move, the meaning of Amos 5:26–27a is turned on its head from a negative tone of judgment to one of hope. The tabernacle of your king, for CD, is that which will be resurrected in "Damascus," thus justifying the sect's attitude of rejection of and exile from the Jerusalem Temple and the high priesthood.¹²⁷ This fact and the interpretation to follow indicates that CD-A reads the normative text at a tremendous metaphorical elasticity (metaphors that seem to be made up by the author himself) so that the text has a direct interpretive connection to the present interpretive setting of CD. That is, the historical accuracy for CD of what or who Sikkuth was is of little consequence in light of the interpretive quality the text provides for the author of CD.

IV.a.2 Kiyun as Your Prophets

CD-A 7:15 says, "... Kiyun of your images away from my tent to Damascus." There is no change in this phrase from the MT.¹²⁸ The phrase "Kiyun of your images" is interpreted by CD as "the books of the prophets." In the same manner as the phrase "tabernacle of your king," this phrase is similarly discontinuous from Amos in its tone and its meaning, naturally read; CD makes "Kiyun of your images" a positive aspect of faithful worship.

Again, the focal point of the midrash is upon the "tent" (אהל) and exile away from it. Davies correctly understands the "tent" (אהל) as the temple in Jerusalem from which the books of the prophets have been exiled. For CD it would seem that the exiling of these books should be of little surprise or consequence to the Jerusalem-based Israelites since "Israel despised" the words of these books. Davies also helpfully observes that by "the prophets," CD indicates "the Law and the prophets." What he means is that the prophets carry the right interpretation of the law, which CD says Israel "despises." Davies observes that "the prophets [are] regularly presented in CD, not as predictors but preachers of the law."¹²⁹ In essence, the law of God has been exiled to the place where this

¹²⁶ Steyn, "Trajectories," 3.

¹²⁷ Steyn, "Trajectories," 3–4.

¹²⁸ For more on the discrepancy between the Hebrew phrase צֶלְמֵיכֶם וְאֵת כִּיּוֹן and the LXX translation, "Star of your god Rephan" (τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ραιφᾶν) see Steyn, "Trajectories," 5; and Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 260.

¹²⁹ Davies, "Ideology," 300.

sect has set up their place of worship and where they can possess the law since it has been “despised” in Jerusalem. Exile, unlike in the normative text of Amos, is read by CD as a positive redemptive-historical move for this community.

IV.a.3 Damascus as a Good Exile

CD-A 7:15 says that both the tabernacle of David (for CD-A, this represents “the Law”) and the Prophets are “[exiled] from my tent to Damascus.” As already noted, CD substitutes in its reading of Amos 5 “from my tent to Damascus” (דמשק מאהלי) for the MT’s “beyond Damascus” (מהלאה לדמשק). CD continues its positive reading and adaptation of Amos 5:26–27a, indicating that exile does not mean judgment for its sect but liberation. Wolff notes, “[Amos 5:26 and 27a] are combined to form a citation which is interpreted as a promise of deliverance.”¹³⁰ Though the parts of Amos alluded to by CD are not themselves saying anything of deliverance, the interpretive moves made by CD when it reads the normative text combine to make Amos a hermeneutical vehicle for making known an imminent deliverance of its sect in exile.

What CD means by “Damascus” in 7:15 and 19, however, is still debated. Two major positions are taken. First, it is understood in its natural sense as a physical locale. Wolff says this is the better option because “the name ‘Damascus’ from Amos 5:27 is cited in CD 7.15 ... but unlike the other keywords in the Amos text, [it] is not specifically interpreted.”¹³¹ But Steyn calls into question Wolff’s conclusion, saying, “the fact that the phrase is not specifically interpreted here ... does not necessarily support the option of a geographic locale.”¹³² The other major option for interpretation is that ‘Damascus’ is a symbolic location. Steyn says that its symbolic reference may have been “so obvious to them, that no explanation on this point was needed.”¹³³ As Steyn and Davies agree, it is a location that is frequently referenced in CD as a place that is associated with exile and the making of covenant between God and his people which is continuous with Deut. 4:25–28 (cf. CD 6:5, 19; 7:19; 19:34; 20:12).¹³⁴ In this view, “Damascus” is the figurative place that stands for Babylon, where the “Interpreter of the Law” brought the sect that wrote CD into existence (cf. CD 6:7; 8:21; 19:34). Either opinion is possible since neither of the two fundamentally undermines the meaning of the other since they overlap at certain levels.

¹³⁰ Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 266–67.

¹³¹ Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 267.

¹³² Steyn, “Trajectories,” 4.

¹³³ Steyn, “Trajectories,” 4.

¹³⁴ Cf. Philip R. Davies, “Damascus Rule (CD),” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 2, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 8; Steyn, “Trajectories,” 4.

However, instead of placing the focus primarily on the issues of "Damascus," that it is either a physical place or that it is symbolic for a sacred place indicating their genesis as a community, it is better to view it in this context as a place that is "not Jerusalem." For CD, justifying exile from a presumably tainted temple and corrupt priesthood (cf. CD 7:15 [מֵאֵהֶלִי דְמֶשֶׁק]; 7:18 [בְּזֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵת אֲשֶׁר דְּבָרֵיהֶם]) is at the heart of the midrash on Amos 5:26–27a.¹³⁵ What makes them more godly is their exile with the Law and the Prophets and the tabernacle of David to a place that is away from the place where the law of the Lord is despised and where judgment will be handed down (cf. 7:13 [לְחָרֵב הַסִּגְרֹוּ וְהַנְּסֻגִּים]; 8:1 [לְחָרֵב הַסִּגְרֹוּ וְהַנְּסֻגִּים]), namely, Jerusalem.

iv.b Summary

The major thrust of the midrash on Amos 5:26–27a is that one faithful people is exiled from an unfaithful and corrupt religious system. For CD, exile is a sign of faithfulness, not faithlessness. Unlike Luke, who is reading a Greek text and locating the idolatry spoken of by the prophet in the Exodus, CD is most plausibly reading the MT version of Amos (though this is still in question according to the PTSDSSP¹³⁶) and exile is key to its reading. However, against the grain of the historical events of the Exile, CD reads the exile as holding a meaning that is positive. CD holds that their sect truly possesses the law, and its members are sent away with it from those who despise it. Wolff probably characterizes the midrash in CD-A 7:13–8:1 correctly as a justification for those who undertook exile and separation from Jerusalem in order to observe and practice the law properly.¹³⁷

In the process of its reading of the normative text, however, CD completely turns Amos 5:26–27 on its head, in light of a natural reading of Amos 5:25–27. In hope, CD understands the principle terms from Amos (i.e., exile, Sikkuth, Kiyun, and Damascus) as meaning the destiny of faithful law enactment. In Amos, however, exile is the punishment of the Lord by removing his protective presence from his people in the day of the Lord. The key terms in the context of Amos indicate Israel's fundamental covenant breaking. For CD, those who are not exiled to Damascus or who lack Sikkuth and Kiyun are those who did not "hold firmly to the covenant" (cf. 7:13; 8:1).

Briefly, then, what is the occasion for such a reading of Amos 5:26–27 that could be characterized as one that is at the furthest reaches of the meaning

¹³⁵ Cf. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 266; Steyn, "Trajectories," 8.

¹³⁶ Cf. James H. Charlesworth, *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, PTSDSSP (Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox, 1995), 27n72.

¹³⁷ Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 266.

spectrum of Amos? The students of CD are most honest and correct if they admit that the analogies constructed by CD seem arbitrary (the king is the congregation, the Kiyun of your images is the books of the prophets, etc.). The current state of scholarly discussion is speculative on occasion regarding these analogies. And some have even intimated that it is likely that the significance of these images to CD may be completely specific to that community and therefore invented.¹³⁸ CD leaves the origin of these analogies unclear. But CD does make them and is consistent in their application in this pericope. For this sect, there is meaning attached to these images that are helpful for understanding their current state of exile as a positive point of history characterized by exemplary law observance. However, beyond these puzzling analogies, it may be a bit surprising to observe that at a deeper level, CD does share some continuity with the inscripturated prophet, Amos.

Davies says, “[CD-A 7] expresses the view that the divine law no longer resides in the temple, but with the [CD] community in its worship.”¹³⁹ CD, like Amos, is dissatisfied with the state of Israel’s worship. It is not “hold[ing] firmly to the covenant,” CD says twice, and therefore is likely to be idolatrous, and the cultic leadership (the priests) is to blame in large part. But, as Davies points out, contrary to Amos’ specific concern with idolatrous sacrifice, CD is concerned with law observance. Davies says that the temple for CD is “not really an issue.”¹⁴⁰ He says, “The ideology of the Temple in CD is that it is no longer the seat of the law.”¹⁴¹ And he continues that the temple is “one practical problem which is dealt with in terms of the overriding concern of CD: v, 12, the observance of the law.”¹⁴² Likewise, the nuanced continuity CD has with Amos is with true obedience to God’s law, which both Amos and CD strongly imply can only come through worshipping God alone, not simply putting on a good show. Both Amos and CD are concerned about that which Israel holds firmly.

More broadly, the meaning of CD is not so far off the more central concerns of Amos. However, the way CD reads and interprets the major terminology of Amos is quite different from what one would expect from a plain reading of Amos 5:26–27, and one must conclude that the author of CD-A was working on the part of the spectrum that is about as far away as possible from the meaning of the original verbs and nouns of the normative text. By saying this, however, one should not displace CD from the same intertextual field as Luke.

138 Cf. Prato, “Idolatry,” 195–96.

139 Davies, “Ideology,” 300.

140 Davies, “Ideology,” 301.

141 Davies, “Ideology,” 300.

142 Davies, “Ideology,” 301.

Rather, more simply it is CD's reading of Amos that is a good example of the breadth of the intertextual field with which we are working, and in the end, its reading should not be expected to be continuous with the "original" sense or the natural reading of the normative text, because it is far from it from an objective standpoint.

v Amos 5:25–27 in CD-A and Acts 7: Reading Amos 5 in Community

The text appropriated by both CD (7:13–8:1) and Luke (Acts 7:42b–43) is Amos 5:25–27a. Specifically, CD-A is reading Amos 5:26–27a, and following a version of Amos more closely aligned with the Hebrew MT version and LXX-Amos is Luke's text of choice.¹⁴³ For our purposes in this section and to avoid confusion, we will simply refer to the Amos text as Amos 5:25–27 since that is the section of text Luke appeals to (though CD's is a smaller portion of that same text).

Amos 5:25–27, read in its own right, is a prophecy of judgment that calls Israel to consider what the Lord required when they were first called a people, and to observe how that contrasts with their current behavior and worship. The Lord says that he will exile Israel because of the complete breach of their covenant with him. They have rejected the way he desired their relationship to be for a way that is a hollow show, but in truth, idolatrous, immoral, and thoroughly unethical according to his law. Their behavior leads them away from the Lord into exile. It is this message that these two authors look to for application to their contexts.

In Lukan intertextual studies, the interpretation of Amos 5:26–27a in CD-A has only received minor attention with relation to Stephen's quotation of the same text.¹⁴⁴ By such lack of attention, the interpretation of CD seems to have been generally *de facto* rejected as helpful to the study of Stephen's use.

In contrast to this opinion, as with our comparison with TJ 24 with Acts 2 in the previous chapter, it is fruitful and necessary to set an exemplar interpreter in conversation with Luke in order to grasp how each historical context demands similar and different meaning from a text; and how the meaning of a text is simply intrinsic. Now, after interpreting Amos 5:25–27 for ourselves and

¹⁴³ Though the reader should be reminded that CD reads closer to the LXX-Amos with regards to the "tent of Moloch" in Amos 5:26.

¹⁴⁴ Steyn ("Trajectories," 8) comes closest by saying, "It is clear that [the Lukan Stephen] interprets the same quotation differently than CD." But most commentators simply mention the interpretation of CD without further investigation into what it can tell about the reception on Amos 5:25–27. Cf. e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 284, who limits CD to a footnote.

seeing how two different authors utilize the meaning of that text, we should set these two readers of Amos into conversation with our ultimate aim of discovering the function of Amos 5 in Acts 7.

Our study on Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7 began where many others have. The text is a notorious challenge in understanding its place and function in the stream of Stephen's speech. To name a few, Dunn, Pervo and Jervell (though, this objection is not the view of Jervell) raise concerns regarding the Lukan chronology in his retelling of the Exodus idolatry and Pentateuchal history. In other words, at face value, the placement and the supposed meaning of the LXX-Amos quotation between the Lukan retelling of the calf-idolatry and the dispossessing of the nations and the following temple polemic seem incoherent. The interpretive issues with this quotation can be boiled down to Luke making inaccurate historic claims about idolatry in Israel's history and chronological jumps that frankly do not make sense. In view of the conversation that both Luke and CD-A have had independently with Amos 5:25–27 according to how they appropriate the normative text, we begin the discussion between Luke and CD-A and to hear all three voices through the way in which these two interlocutors interact upon their respective reading of the text.

Luke is applying the text of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 to a new narrative and historical context. As we observed him doing in our first study of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2, Luke is contemporizing the normative text of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 into a fresh context. The expectation of some of those noted above that Luke would be following strict lines of historical or literary chronology is initially challenged by the fact that normative Scripture is not used by later readers according to such hermeneutical rules. We have evidence of this outside the Lukan text in the use of the same text in CD-A 7:13–8:1. Like Luke, CD-A is operating within an eschatological trajectory and contemporizing Amos 5:26–27a with the needs of its current situation in mind. Specifically, we should observe where the emphasis of the conversation rests, namely, on how our interlocutors interpret and regard Israel's history in light of their current situation, keeping clearly in mind both the suggested problem of Lukan historical inaccuracy raised by the interpreters noted already and further the specific theological emphasis that shared hermeneutic draws out.

Among the three voices represented in our conversation, Amos 5:25–27 is distinctive and has the potential to be a contextually puzzling rhetorical section. For the student of Acts, this is an important observation to be made, since the implicit belief seems to be that Acts 7 alone experiences this obscurity. However, we would suggest that this interpretive issue is not unique to Acts 7. In fact, those scholars and commentators, as noted above, clearly did not take

the time to hear the voice of CD-A (and likely have not dealt carefully enough with the genres represented in the source text).

The Lukan use of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 does present hermeneutical complexity and is ultimately used to draw an analogy between eras in Israel's history. However, after reading Acts in conversation with CD-A one can see that there is a certain tradition of reading this text that supports a type of historical-analogical reading that is anything but linear or straightforward. Our study has demonstrated this explicitly above. On this point, there is a major agreement between Luke and CD-A.

Both CD-A and Luke hold in common that Amos 5:25–27 can be read in a way that interprets Israel's history with an interpretive analogy. In fact, going even back to the normative text of LXX-Amos 5:25–27, these three verses stand out from its context. One is reminded that it is at this point that the Amos prophecy leaves verse literary form and quickly breaks into and then out of a narrative retelling of Israel's "ideal past" (a past that Israel viewed as idyllic which was not as sterling as they remembered) in contrast to their current plight (importantly, the narrative portion of Amos 5 consists exclusively of the source text in question; 5:25–27). Our interlocutors, in their use of the source text, resemble in a striking way the creative and analogical appeal to history which our source exhibits. However, the hermeneutic utilized by our interlocutors leads to a more important question about what goal the hermeneutic serves; namely, why would they contemporize the text analogically rather than placing the text into a much more cogent and literal interpretive frame of reference? Otherwise put, what theological point are they getting at by using the text in this way, and does the conversation between interlocutors add clarity to the Lukan purpose?

Certainly, there is central importance given to idolatry by Luke and by analogy, Israel's past idolatry (in the "golden years" of their Exodus from Egypt) is being likened to Israel's current allegiance to the temple system that is driving many of Stephen's countrymen to persecute Jesus' disciples and reject his lordship. But for many, the way Luke ties in LXX-Amos 5:25–27 is problematic, because it does not seem to fit in Israel's history cogently. Like his two interlocutors LXX-Amos and CD-A, Israel's history adequately understood and interpreted is of primary importance to Luke and his contemporary situation. But Israel's history, for Luke (and any later reader, in fact) can only be heard according to his contemporary context.

Some, like van de Sandt, have tried via sophisticated intertextual hermeneutics to untangle the Lukan Stephen's interpretation of this text, but their primary appeals to extra-Lukan and in fact extra-Amos textual sources leave the

reader wondering whose intertextuality we are studying, Luke's or that of the one studying Luke. However, in light of an imaginary conversation between Luke and CD-A, which creates for the interpreter of the Lukan text, a context among other readers of the same text, the use of history as analogy gives clarity. So what does the conversation between our interlocutors and their agreed hermeneutic highlight concerning the Lukan use of LXX-Amos text that others may be missing?

One particular theme jumps off the page in the conversation between our interlocutors' use of Amos 5:25–27 and specifically their analogical way of reading the text, namely, the rejection of the Lord in favor of their idolatrous way.

The primary way in which Luke and CD agree is how their analogies drive Amos 5:25–27 towards a similar view of the temple or temple system. Both authors stand outside the Jerusalem Temple. Both apply the normative text to a schism where, on one side, there is the faithful and on the other the unfaithful. And both authors, when standing outside the Temple in Jerusalem, claim true faithfulness to God's provision and plan in true devotion to the Lord.

For the Lukan Stephen, the temple has become idolatrous according to what he believes is a predictable pattern of Israelite behavior. The cause and implications of such idolatry are finally revealed at the close of his speech (cf. Acts 7:51–53). In the end, the schism is between the Jews who follow Jesus and the Jews who reject him as God's anointed Lord and "prophet like [Moses]."

CD agrees with Luke that a schism is revealed in reference to the temple, between the faithful and those called "backsliders" (CD-A 7:13, 8:1; הנסוגים), those who despise the words of the prophets (CD-A 7:17–18). The faithful, for CD, are sent to a 'non-Jerusalem' place.¹⁴⁵ They are sent to a place where their faithfulness can be practiced away from the corrupted temple (cf. CD 7:15 [דמשק מאהלי]; 7:18 [בזה ישראל את אשר דבריהם]),¹⁴⁶ and a temple of pure law observance can be constructed by God. This figurative place, Damascus, is an idyllic place. Those who are not in Damascus and lack Sikkuth and Kiyun are in contradiction to the covenant.¹⁴⁷ The concern for CD is to preserve the law, the tabernacle of David, which leads them to see in the Amos text exile as a place that is away from the place where the law of the Lord is despised, and where judgment will be handed down (cf. 7:13 [לחרב הוּסְגְרוּ הַנְּסוּגִים וְכָל]; 8:1 [לחרב] [הַסְּגִירוּ וְהַנְּסוּגִים]), namely, on Jerusalem and presumably its leadership.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 266–67.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 266; Steyn, "Trajectories," 8.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Davies, "Ideology," 301.

¹⁴⁸ Davies, "Ideology," 300.

Both Luke and CD-A are appropriating the Amos text in a way that does not feel like its most natural way of being used. But as we pointed out in our first chapter in reference to Litwak's comments of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2, we must be careful that we do not ask the one reading the text to read it in the wrong direction. In application to a new context that experiences increasing ethnic and religious turmoil, CD-A and Luke read Amos out of the TP in order to draw out themes of idolatry and the Lord's judgment upon it. With reference to the hermeneutics of our readers' interpretation of the source text, to read Amos 5:25–27 narrowly, according to a "natural reading," misses the point. Analogy is woven into the fabric of the source text and reading it in this way, according to a particular tradition of reading this text, is the most natural way to read it. So when Luke works LXX-Amos 5:25–27 into his narrative (out of his greater construal of his reading of the LXX-TP) he is reading the text in the right direction, according to the way texts are meant to be read and the way texts *are read* according to other readers of his milieu (in our case, CD-A). In the end, this particular interlocation of CD-A and Luke over the Amos text in question finds explicit agreement upon the fact that their new setting (the setting these readers exegete by use of the Amos text) is about a people being split over idolatry, and even more enlightening to the interpreter of Luke, the temple.

In our study of the Lukan text in light of the dynamic process of reception, these observations help us to better to understand and critique Kilgallen's comment above. Kilgallen would hold and it should be emphasized *without taking into account the interpretation of CD-A*, that the Lukan Stephen means to say that the Temple system is an unapproved system of worship, and therefore in itself an idolatrous system of worship and an effrontery to the Lord. But this is a misreading of the text. It is the attitude that Israel has taken regarding the temple and not the temple itself that makes it idolatrous. Much in the same way as the worship in LXX-Amos 5:25–27, the Temple in Jerusalem is not on its own idolatrous, but becomes that way when the Lord reveals that he is displeased with such acts of insincere devotion, because they are more of a show of power and wealth than a sacrifice to him. Our interlocation shows us the same thing. The Temple in Jerusalem is being condemned by CD-A because of the attitudes of the "backsliders" and its idolatrous worship. But CD-A goes and sets up *a new temple*. This is substantiated by recalling that CD does not polemicize against the temple, but rather against the "backsliders" (CD-A 7:13, 8:1; הנסוגים) who despise the words of the prophets (CD-A 7:17–18). The faithful, for CD, are sent to a 'non-Jerusalem' place. They are sent to a place where their faithfulness can be practiced away from *a corrupted Temple* (cf. CD 7:15 [בזה ישראל את אשר דבריהם]; 7:18 [דמשק מאהלי]), not the temple itself. In fact, their analogy constructs a new temple.

Of course, as we can see, exile is a point of disagreement between Luke and CD-A. Luke contends, in close continuity to the more natural way of reading LXX-Amos 5:25–27, that the text says that exile is for those who are unfaithful to God and disobedient to his plan. For Luke, the exilic motif found in Acts 7 reveals an unfaithful people (i.e., those who reject the “Righteous One”) who are like Israel and rejected God’s appointed prophet, Moses. As a result, they experienced God’s “turning” and their removal from his presence. Exile appears to remain a punishment for the idolater, and a place that is devoid of the presence of the Lord. This is a self-designated exile since Jesus is that Lord that Israel parts from for the temple.

On the other hand, CD reads the text of Amos 5:26–27a almost entirely against a “natural reading” of the text. For CD, exile is for the faithful who seek to escape a corrupted temple and who want to observe pure obedience to the law.

However, the point remains that the act of reading the normative text will never take the shape of a so-called “natural reading” (or “original reading”). This is not how the text can be read. For example, it could be supposed that Luke agrees with CD-A about a “faithful exile” in Acts 7. After the stoning of Stephen, the early Christian church experiences a literal exile from Jerusalem because of the outbreak of persecution. The exile of the “faithful” in Acts 7 might be similar to the exile for which CD hopes for its faithful, but the exile in Acts 7 happens differently from that envisioned by CD in that it is not voluntary but compulsory.

Taken with our interpretation of Luke, we can see that the emphasis of the conversation is upon history and the text of Amos 5:25–27, but according to how it applies in a very specific way to a situation of schism, and in light of what that schism says about the Lord. The emphasis we take away from this conversation is not what Luke is doing with the text regarding chronology or history, because the normative text was not even concerned with this fact. Each of our three interlocutors is simply conveying, though in unique ways, what the worship of God’s people and what they are worshipping says about whom they believe the Lord to be, and what will befall them in light of that reality. Helpfully to the Lukan scholar, his contemporary interlocutor, CD-A, is interpreting the same text in light of the same object, namely, the temple, and what that means for the schism in his day. In the end, this is the most significant argument for Lukan cogency in his use of LXX-Amos 5:25–27, *pace* those commentators whom Jervell noted earlier (who could potentially include Kilgallen and his understanding of the temple in Acts 7) who believe that Luke’s thought is muddled at 7:42. In other words, the “natural reading” of the text LXX-Amos 5:25–27 may not be about the temple vis-a-vis the worship

of the Lord and right recognition of him in true worship, but according to a specific tradition it is. It thus would fit into the stream of logic in the Lukan Stephen's speech in Acts 7.

Our conversation between interlocutors highlights that the text of Amos 5:25–27 is not to be read in a historically literal or chronological way for its meaning to apply to a new context. Rather, the text is to be read in a progressive direction (not "backwards" towards an assumed "original meaning"), with some great typological and analogical liberties taken (according to the tradition of interpretation we have observed). One must read along with our interlocutors to see that though Amos 5:25–27 is not about a temple, the new context is about that very thing, and the text exegetes that new context.

To conclude on the meaning for Luke, one must see that it is not the temple that is inherently a corrupt system or object. But the temple and its system have become an incredibly large and imposing roadblock in the way of ethnic Israel to recognize Jesus as Lord. The Jews face exile if they do not disown their allegiance to the temple that is drawing them away from the Lord of "the day of the Lord" for which LXX-Joel 3:1–5 laid the foundation in Acts 2. The accusers who level three allegations against the Lukan Stephen are ironically guilty of those very allegations, and Stephen is not. It is the accusers who will, if they do not recognize God's "Righteous One," be exiled; this exile is self-imposed since they drive the faithful away from them via persecution and separate themselves from the Lord, because they refuse to recognize Jesus as Lord.

Moving forward in Acts and the place of the Lukan construal of the LXX-TP in this narrative, one must focus on the continued response of cultural Israel to the reality of the day of the Lord, and Jesus being that Lord. Cultural Israel, according to the Lukan Stephen, and notably the analogy he draws between the calf idolatry and the present-day temple idolatry with his use of LXX-Amos 5:25–27, warns of a self-imposed exile that could potentially cause seismic ecclesiological division and judgment. The ecclesiological topic is only still an implication of this portion of Acts though it is its impending reality which is more strongly being hinted at. The emphasis remains on revealing who the Lord is, namely, Jesus. Central to the more veiled statement of Jesus' Lordship here in Acts 7 and its inaugurated implications is the promise that the identity of his faithful people will continue to be revealed as the Lukan reading of the LXX-TP. It is pursued to the next quotation in Acts 13 where we find LXX-Hab. 1:5 plays a key role in the first uncircumcised Gentile naming Jesus as Lord.

“I Am Doing a Work”: the Gentiles as God’s People and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13

The Text of LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 and of Acts 13:41

LXX-Habakkuk 1:5

⁵ ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, διότι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῇται.

Acts 13:41

⁴¹ ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, []
καὶ θαυμάσατε [] καὶ ἀφανίσθητε,
ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν,
ἔργον ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῇται ὑμῖν.

I Introduction

The third quotation of the LXX-Book-of-the-Twelve in Acts is found in Paul’s speech at a synagogue in Pisidian Antioch. This location is the traditional home of Luke according to Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.4.6) and Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 7)¹ and the location of those who were first called “Christians” (ὁ Χριστιανός).² The quotation is found in Acts 13:41 and is from LXX-Habakkuk 1:5.

1 For more on the discussion concerning Luke’s origin, see Eckhard Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission* (Downers Grove; Leicester: IVP; Apollos, 2004), 785, 787–88; Rainer Riesner, *Die Frühzeit Des Apostels Paulus: Studien Zur Chronologie, Missionsstrategie und Theologie*, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 98.

2 For more on the historical circumstances surrounding the naming of the first Christian believers, see Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 103; Baruch Lifshitz, “L’Origine Du Nom Des Chrétiens,” *VC* 16, no. 2 (1962): 65–70; Schnabel, *Mission*, 792–94; Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 225–30.

In his first speech, the Lukan Paul addresses a diverse audience, namely, "men of Israel and you who fear God" (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν).³ The diversity of Paul's audience is representative of the fuller ethnic and religious diversity of Antioch as a city.⁴ Some have gone as far as saying that there was an "intense Jewish religious influence on the Antiochene Gentiles"⁵ and that this influence "seemed to create a substantial stratum of these sympathetic Gentiles [i.e., "God-fearers"]".⁶ This fact does not seem insignificant, given Paul's message of Gentile inclusion that will be explored more fully below in light of the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5.⁷

The Lukan Paul gives two speeches in Acts 13. His first speech in Antioch is a history of Israel through the lens of David as king⁸ (compare this to Acts 2

- 3 In Acts, besides Israelites, Paul addresses "those who fear God" (οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, 13:16), a category of people also referred to in Acts 13 as "devout converts" (τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων, 13:43) and "devout women" (τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας, 13:50). The debate concerning the identity of "the God-fearers" has not been a small one. In fact, Schnabel summarizes a long, well-known debate between Thomas Krabel and Louis Feldman about this group's identity (cf. Schnabel, *Mission*, 130). However, for our purposes and understanding of the identity of this group, Schnabel's observation is helpful when he notes that the "God-fearers" make up a fourth group alongside Gentile, Jews, and proselytes, and were those "Gentiles in the synagogue ... [who] had not formally converted" (cf. Schnabel, *Mission*, 130; cf. also, Barrett, *Acts*: 1-14, 630; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 353; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 451; Hengel and Schwemer, *Paul*, 61-70; also for the relation of the Gentile mission with the synagogue, cf. Jervell, *Luke*, 61-62). However, with regard to the Lukan Paul's use of τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων, Levinskaya (*The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 135) gives reason to believe, for Antioch and the prevailing Jewish influence in this city, proselyte and "God-fearer" may have been used interchangeably.
- 4 For more on the religious diversity of Antioch see Keener, *Acts*: 3:1-14:28, 2041-44. And for a description of the broader local population in areas surrounding, see Robyn Tracey, "Syria," in *The Book of Acts: Greco-Roman Setting*, ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 257-65. Cf. Josephus, *AJ* 12.119. On early church gatherings, including this one observed here, see Aaron W. White, "Gathered Together: The Grammar of 'Church' from Acts," *Presbyterion* 45 no. 2 (2019), 60-79.
- 5 Schnabel, *Mission*, 784-85. Some demur at this point, especially if this claim implies major Jewish residence in Antioch. See on this Keener, *Acts*: 3:1-14:28, 2043; Levinskaya, *Diaspora Setting*, 150. For more on Syrian syncretism, see Hengel and Schwemer, *Paul*, 268-79.
- 6 Levinskaya, *Diaspora Setting*, 135. Cf. also John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 254.
- 7 For a proper treatment on the history that surrounds the Christian expulsion from Jerusalem, see Hengel, *History*, 71-80.
- 8 Like Stephen's speech, Paul's speech connects his present situation and the proclamation of the gospel to Israel's history (Johnson, *Acts*, 237; van de Sandt, "A Reflection"). However, there are also important differences between the use of Israel's history by the Lukan Stephen and the Lukan Paul that cannot be covered here, since the burden of this investigation is not upon this issue (cf. Keener, *Acts*: 3:1-14:28, 2026). For more on the Lukan Paul's use of history in Acts 13, see Tannehill, *Acts*, 166-67.

where his role is expressly προφήτης) and by a popular request he delivers a second speech in Antioch a week later (13:42).

As it will become apparent below, the location of the Hab. 1:5 quotation is essential in its literary context. It is situated at the very end of Paul's gospel proclamation in his first speech and is followed four verses later with Paul's second speech. The context of the quotation creates a soteriological and ecclesiological tension in relation to the two speeches given by Paul. The first speech is a proclamation to the Jews and God-fearers, but to everyone's surprise, the second proclamation the following week is to Gentiles when God turns from those at the synagogue with his sights on Gentiles qua Gentiles.⁹ This tension is a turning point in redemptive-history that sets the context for the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13; and indeed for Acts as a whole.¹⁰

1.a *A Brief History of Interpretation of LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13*

A more thorough "history of interpretation" will be given below in section III.a which looks specifically at the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 as it connects to the quotation at the verbal level. Here we will give a broad understanding of the current discussion surrounding this quotation and its problems.

In the past, it has been common for this quotation to be interpreted as a warning to those in the Lukan Paul's audience who would deny Jesus as Messiah. In this way, the quotation is read with stronger relation to the Lukan Paul's first speech that concerns the work of God in Jesus than to his

9 Tannehill (*Acts*, 165) probably makes the key observation about how the two speeches of Paul relate and even how they reach back to what Stephen was addressing in Acts 7, observing that,

The [first] speech and Paul's response to Jewish jealousy a week later must be viewed together. *They stand in tension with each other*, for, on the one hand, Paul announces that the word of salvation has been sent to his synagogue audience (13:26), and, on the other hand, he announces that he is turning to the Gentiles in the face of Jewish rejection. The speech concerns the fulfillment of God's promise to the Jewish people, bringing them salvation. We must not forget the message of the speech when we hear that Paul is turning to the Gentiles. Both aspects together, when each is given full weight, express a central problem that pervades the following narrative: God has acted for Israel's salvation, but the effects of that saving work are limited by repeated rejection.

Tannehill's observation is vital for understanding what is happening in the Lukan narrative, however concerning the extent of salvation, he may not be interpreting Luke correctly. Luke does not seem to suggest at any point that God's plan has in any way been "limited" by human volition, and the Lukan narrative only supports this notion. Rather, it seems more accurate to that Luke is suggesting that God knew of this rejection, and this is the very point of Habakkuk 1:5, as well as Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43. Therefore, according to Luke's use of Scripture, it is better to observe that no human has limited God's power nor held his plan back from completion. Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 236.

10 See the beginning of section III for the text of Acts 13:41 (i.e., the LXX-Hab. 1:5 quotation), in full.

second that concerns the reception of the gospel by the Gentiles qua Gentiles. Hand-in-hand with this majority interpretation is the view that the Lukan "self-fulfilling prophecy"¹¹ for Paul's "incredulous [Jewish] hearers"¹² in Antioch follows his appropriation of LXX-Hab. Such an interpretation seems to have held sway back as far as Calvin who says,

[Hab. 1:5] is quoted by Paul, and is applied to the punishment then awaiting the Jews; for Paul, having offered Christ to them, and seeing that many of them regarded the preaching of the gospel with scorn, added [the LXX-Hab. quotation] ... No wonder then that Paul set before them this vengeance, when the Jews of his time persisted through their unbelief to reject Christ.¹³

This view implies that the reception of the gospel by the Antiochene Gentiles is the result of the Jewish callousness and ultimate rejection. However, at this moment of tension in the narrative of the Pauline visit to Pisidian-Antioch there is one major aspect that creates a problem for this traditional interpretation. This problem leads to further lines of questioning into the context of Luke's reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5.

Contrary to the traditional lines of argument concerning what this quotation, there is a warm reception by the Jewish and god-fearing audience to the first speech. The astonishment of the crowd reported in the context of the second speech must have a different referent than suggest by Calvin and his inheritors. Instead of it being the identity and message of Jesus' lordship—the gospel—the only clear object that bears the indignation of the Jewish and god-fearing audience is the sudden Gentile inclusion when the whole of the city hears the gospel and receives it. If the context is read in this direction, the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in this specific redemptive-historical context marks an important the ecclesiological turning-point in Acts and moves the narrative forward in understanding Jesus as universal Lord over all nations.¹⁴ This former view is not so progressive.

11 Johnson, *Acts*, 236.

12 F. F. Bruce, "Habakkuk," in *The Minor Prophets*, ed. McComisky (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 847.

13 John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Twelve Prophets: Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai*, trans. John Owen (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1848), 26. Along with Calvin, Johnson, and Bruce (already cited), cf. also Dodd (*According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*, 87) and Tannehill (*Acts*, 173). Though Tannehill rightly emphasizes the importance of "the discovery of Gentiles as fellow citizens in Jesus' messianic state is the major stumbling block for the Jews ..." (*Acts*, 172).

14 Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 237.

1.b *Astonishment at a Turning Point in Redemptive-History: the Argument of This Chapter*

With his reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13, amidst his broader theological construal of the LXX-TP in Acts Luke is now concerned to demonstrate the early church's understanding and reception of Jesus as being the messiah and Lord for all nations. He is asking of his reading if they are fully grasping what was said in Acts 1:6–8 and 2:39 as Peter had to in a more personal setting in Acts 10.

As such, the classic interpretation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 as a warning ignored by Paul's first audience in Antioch is not only wrong according to the Lukan appropriation of this text but minimizes the importance of Hab. 1:5 in the grand scheme of Acts 13, as well as in the broader narrative movement of Acts. Luke is undoubtedly revealing to the student of Acts 13 something "unbelievable" and "astounding," something revealed already to an intimate audience in Acts 10, but that thing is not the preaching of Jesus as Lord and his work. Now more clearly to a corporate audience (whereas, as noted, Acts 10 tells of a much more private and contained setting and of the conversion of the house of one who is more likely to be a God-fearer than completely unassociated with the synagogue), Jesus is being proclaimed as messiah and Lord of the Jews *as well as* the uncircumcised Gentiles.

At this stage of Acts what is "unbelievable" is no longer the news of God's work through the anointed Lord Jesus as the one who brings salvation in the last days. This may be regarded as old news at this point of Acts. Instead, Luke is suggesting before the witness of a diverse diaspora audience that the salvation brought by Jesus is for Gentiles, even those who do not in a religious way follow the Law of Moses (i.e., proselytes and God-fearers; cf. 13:39).

Key to observing the progressing storyline in Acts and the role of this quotation in Luke's overall program of interpreting the Twelve Prophets for the narrative of Acts is the Lukan emphasis of the theme of *ἐργον*. This particular theme within the context of the differing audiences between Paul's first and second speech (as described by the text) begins to paint a picture of where Acts is headed concerning the make-up of the church and who Jesus is Lord over.

As Johnson has observed, LXX-Hab. 1:5 is a "self-fulfilling prophecy." But in spite of Johnson and many who hold to the majority position noted above, the prophecy that is fulfilled is that the Jews do not accept an anointed (i.e., messianic) Lord who is for all nations. In fact, as we have already said, the significant challenge for the traditionally held belief that the Jewish rejection of the gospel began the Gentile mission is that the Jewish and god-fearing audience does receive the gospel warmly, but not a multi-national vision of the gospel

that is apart from the synagogue and its requirements.¹⁵ In other words, Luke is demonstrating here that God's astonishing work is to include the Gentiles *as Gentiles*. This is expressly in light of Jesus' revealed identity, which is so readily welcomed in Paul's first speech, but also includes the controversial message that God's long-before-planned work is to offer salvation universally through Jesus.

We will once again observe Luke's reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 "in conversation" with an interlocutor from his milieu. 1QpHabakkuk also reads the same text as Luke and will make a suitable partner for the Lukan reading. Our investigation of and conclusions concerning the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5, as well as other conclusions upon the Lukan text, will be assessed in light of this specific conversation among readers. As a result, new conclusions about the Lukan construal of this portion of the LXX-TP in Acts will be proposed.

However, before an investigation is undertaken of the Lukan text that appropriates Hab. 1:5, a brief excursion will be taken through the prophecy of Habakkuk, with particular focus on, of course, Hab. 1:5 and its place in the prophecy. This initial step has, at this point, become customary for the reader of this study, but it is not merely a perfunctory step in the method. Instead, it is an integral step in hearing the Lukan voice. If we aim to read Luke as an interpreter of Habakkuk, we must attend to the normative text of the inscripturated prophet himself and become its student in order to be able to perceive the best interpretation of its receptors such as Luke and 1QHab.

II Habakkuk: the Announcement of an Amazing Judgment

The prophecy of Habakkuk can be understood as a call-and-response dialogue between the inscripturated prophet, Habakkuk, and the Lord. The primary subject of the prophecy is a complaint from the prophet about the lawlessness in the world, specifically aimed at the injustice practiced by his own people,

¹⁵ Jervell (*Luke*, 41) articulates this view well, which is not at all his own:

"Luke describes the rejection of the Christian proclamation on the part of the Jewish people. Only after and because Israel has rejected the gospel, and for that reason has itself been rejected, do the missionaries turn to the Gentiles. Because of the behavior of Israel, the Gentile mission was set free, so that precisely the Jewish rejection of the missionary message proved to be the decisive presupposition for the Gentile mission."

Concerning this passage, Richard slightly critiques Jervell's tendency for claiming too much continuity between Israel and the church, cf. Earl Richard, "The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15)," in *SBL Seminar Papers* (1980), 267–82.

Israel, and the way in which this lawlessness allows the righteous to be overrun and abused by the wicked.

Habakkuk appears to claim the inaction of the Lord in view of these injustices and disregard for the law (cf. 1:2–4). The Lord, however, has a plan to take action that involves the world that Habakkuk and a larger assumed audience would find it impossible to comprehend, even when told explicitly.¹⁶ Anderson puts the LORD's responses quite succinctly, noting,

Habakkuk saw only distressing lawlessness in the world. God invites him to look at it so as to see justice in that violence, not in spite of it ... Habakkuk's sights are being raised.¹⁷

The vision Habakkuk receives reveals the LORD's plan to his prophet, a plan that would otherwise be unknowable or unbelievable to his people,¹⁸ and Hab. 1:5 is the programmatic statement for the understanding of the prophecy and its dialogue.

11.a *Lifting the Sights of His Prophet: the Astonishing, Future Work of the LORD*

Habakkuk 1:5 is the beginning of the Lord's first response to Habakkuk and is the single verse appropriated by Luke in Acts 13. It says,

¹⁶ The prophecy of Habakkuk, with regards to audience, never actually addresses Israel. The word of the LORD is directed to Habakkuk (though missing in 1:5 such markers as “thus says the LORD,” indicating that he is the one who speaks), and the prophecy is a rare glimpse into the interaction between the LORD and his prophet, with the implication that an audience will be hearing this interaction later. For more comment on the interaction between the LORD and Habakkuk, distinct to this prophecy, cf. Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets, Part 2* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 105; Francis I. Andersen, *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 139; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 464. And for a nuanced analysis of the unique literary traits of Habakkuk, cf. House, *Dramatic Coherence*, 196–200.

¹⁷ Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 139. Anderson further notes that a similar call for God's people to see more than what is immediately obvious and be amazed has happened before in Ex. 34:10.

¹⁸ Anderson (*Habakkuk*, 141) rightly notes in view of the larger plans the LORD has and the complaint of Habakkuk,

“The purposes of God for one person or one nation can be understood only in terms of the whole world. This means that God alone understands it all, while humans get glimpses. The purpose of God for one period of time (“your days” [v 5bA]) can be understood only in terms of eternity (v 12) and eschatology.”
Cf. also Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, 106.

Look, you despisers, and watch; and marvel¹⁹ at marvelous (θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια²⁰) things and vanish, for I am working a work in your days²¹ that you would not believe if someone would have told you.²²

The Lord is responding to Habakkuk's question of "How long..." ("Εως τίνοος, κύριε ...") that effectively begins the prophecy in 1:2. The Lord does not answer this question exactly. Instead, he responds simply with one event—its revealed meaning and agent. He intends to raise the Chaldeans (1:6), a foreign nation, and, by the strength the Lord gives them (1:11), he intends to punish the wickedness decried by Habakkuk.²³

Andersen suggests that the tone of the Lord in his response to his prophet Habakkuk is "remorseless."²⁴ Further, he says that the Lord's response is "shocking for listeners," and that is the "intended" effect (v 5aB).²⁵ Andersen correctly reads the force of the Lord's emotion. It is true; the Lord's tone does seem quite matter-of-fact and meant to arouse the attention of his conversation partner, but "remorseless"? That seems to make the statement of the Lord's more than it is, especially in light of the simple fact that the Lord seems to care enough to reveal to his people his incomprehensible plan. Should we then believe that the Lord is without care for his people? No, certainly not. We have no reason to apply such characterization to the Lord so early in the prophetic dialogue. In fact, it may seem that it is more plausible to assume the opposite.

-
- 19 Luke edits out ἐπιβλέψατε from his use of LXX-Hab. 1:5, much like the next edit, because it is probably redundant in light the emphatic "behold" (ἴδετε) just before it.
 - 20 Here Luke edits out θαυμάσια. The reason is unclear why Luke would edit this word out, beyond potentially his view that the word is redundant, and not his own emphasis.
 - 21 In spite of what seems to be Luke's tendency to weed out redundancy, as per the previous two edits, ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι is kept as it is found in the present text of LXX-Hab. 1:5, and in fact Luke adds ἔργον, which will be taken up in discussion below in section 111.
 - 22 My translation is from the critical Greek version in Zeigler, *Duodecim Prophetae*.
 - 23 George A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (Paternoster Row: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903), 124; Samuel E. Balentine, *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: A Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 183.
 - 24 Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 139.
 - 25 Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 139. Calvin in his lectures on Habakkuk seems to imply a similar view, stating in sum that God's stance is that of frustration towards his people and their disbelief ("[God] is wearied with exercising patience so long"), and that his astonishing work will reprove them (cf. *Twelve Prophets*, 24–25). The context of Habakkuk does not allow the interpreter liberties to make such conclusions, especially on through the first 11 verses of the prophecy. Too many things, most importantly the identity of the oppressors and "the despisers" (in the LXX, οἱ καταφρονῆται) are unknown to come to any firm stance on why the Lord is saying what he is saying, beyond what is explicit, namely, he is looking for a reaction of astonishment.

Instead, the Lord seems to want to reveal the extent of his lordship, reign, and control over the earth, even to the length of the control over a known foe of his people Israel. He must defend the justice of the oppressed, but he must early in this prophecy defend his majesty. His conversation partner, Habakkuk, seems to believe that such injustice and unrighteousness are beyond his control, but with clarity, the Lord states that it is not. Therefore, “remorseless” as such seems to be a miscalculation of the Lord’s tone here.

The clarity with which the Lord responds to his prophet when communicated to his people will bring about the shock and astonishment that his prophet is currently experiencing—shock and astonishment at the more fully revealed universal lordship of Israel’s Lord. The shock does not seem to be specifically about the Lord’s punishment but about the people through whom the Lord is working in order to punish Israel’s injustice and unrighteousness, namely, a non-Israelite nation.

In Hab. 1:5, the Lord raises the sights of Habakkuk and the sights of God’s people to a mysterious reality that will unfold before them, and the reality that is revealed is shocking.²⁶ Interestingly Balentine posits, “[such revelations likely] heighten Habakkuk’s lament rather than solve it.”²⁷ Furthermore, it is not simply Habakkuk whose sights are raised but the scoffers’. To their undoing, the scoffers’ sights are raised so that there is no promise of their repentance but only their destruction (καὶ ἀφανίσθητε²⁸). The extent of the Lord’s power and knowledge is, again, astonishing even to the core of his prophet.

LXX-Hab. says explicitly, if not with emphatic repetition, that the Lord desires a response, namely a response wherein the onlookers would “marvel at marvelous things” (θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια; cf. the MT: והתמהו תמהו²⁹). The

26 Cf. Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 139.

27 Balentine, *Prayer*, 185.

28 The apparent addition of καὶ ἀφανίσθητε by the LXX-Hab. translator for “among the nations” (בְּגוֹיִם) in the Hebrew is what Mulroney calls “free contextual additions,” that is meant to improve upon the text that is translated. Concerning this contextual addition, Mulroney (“A Stone Shall Cry Out From a Wall: Studies on the Translational Style of Old Greek Habakkuk” [New College: University of Edinburgh, 2014], 119) says,

“the additional clause καὶ ἀφανίσθητε exegetically clarifies what is meant, in context, for the scoffers to marvel at marvelous things. It guards against any possible misunderstanding about who is to be destroyed.”

29 The two imperative verbs in the Hebrew are not both translated as verbs in LXX-Hab. The translator, rather, makes the second Hebrew word a substantive. This is an exceptionally difficult translational issue to work out, and is not germane to our purposes here. For an explanation from the perspective that the translator was looking to Hebrew, see Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 142; or that the translator was looking to an Aramaic text, see Mulroney, “A Stone,” 118–19. Though studying two different text bases (Hebrew and Aramaic, respectively), Andersen and Mulroney both believe that the LXX-Hab. translator was looking to

prophecy from the Lord, as observed, is dual in its thrust, namely, action and response. But more importantly, the prophecy is straightforward; the Lord is revealing that the background behind the apparent injustice is that he is preparing to punish wickedness by using a "cruel and quick nation" (τὸ ἔθνος τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ ταχυνόν) that has received its power from the Lord himself for its task.³⁰ For Habakkuk is revealing a judgment event that is much like that of other judgment prophecies; justice will be accomplished by a pagan nation (cf. e.g., Is. 10:28–32; Jer. 4:5–31; LXX-Joel 4:1–17).³¹ The text, however, seems to imply strongly that this will still not satisfy curiosity or the question of theodicy.³² However, despite Andersen's view that Habakkuk's response is primarily to the callous words of the Lord, it is actually the work of the Lord that is astonishing. The dual thrust of 1:5, namely action and response, is based upon the Lord

smooth out the base text, and that he was making certain interpretive adjustments in his translation for clarification.

30 LXX-Hab departs from the Hebrew in 1:11. It says, αὕτη ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ μου, which stems from the translator's reading of the suffix of the final word, אֱלֹהַי, as first-person (LXX: "my God") instead of a third-person possessive pronoun (MT: "his god"). This slightly rare Hebrew form is interpreted by the LXX in order to make Habakkuk's words about the power God gives the Chaldeans to punish the wickedness afflicting the oppressed, and not God's judgment upon the Chaldeans' self-deification, as the MT has it. Regarding the MT, the majority of interpreters understand 1:11 to mean that the Chaldeans are overconfident in their military might, and thus making themselves out to be gods (cf. e.g., Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 466). Andersen, however, suggests that the Hebrew may, in fact, be illustrating a scene where the Chaldeans are sacrificing those nations they are "sweep[ing] by" (1:11) to their god. His translation is: "and he set (offered) [the captives] as a 'āšām (sacrifice) to his god." (Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 160). But, the LXX translator reads the Hebrew in a totally different way. James Mulroney concludes that this "change in LXX/OG Hab is ... unique," and is a place where the translator's technique is "a combination of improvisation and freestyle" ("Rethinking Habakkuk 1:12 in Light of Translation Style and the Literary Character of Ambakoum," *JSCS* 45 [2012]: 88–89). Essentially, the LXX translator desires to make more clear that, not only are the Chaldeans wrong to make themselves out as gods because of their might, but are wrong to believe that their power is from themselves or their gods; but from Habakkuk's God, alone, and for His purposes (cf. Mulroney, "Rethinking," 189).

31 Cf. Theodore Hiebert, "Habakkuk," in *The New Interpreter's Bible: Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature, Daniel, The Twelve Prophets*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 635. Judgment upon the "wicked," and how that judgment comes by the Lord's hand, namely by the Chaldeans, is explicit. What is a little less clear is who the "wicked" are. Most commentators appear to assume the wickedness complained of by the prophet is a domestic problem (cf. e.g., Hiebert, "Habakkuk," 631; Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 463–64). However, Smith reveals that the identity of the oppressor is not at all an open-and-shut case, concluding with Budde that the oppression Habakkuk complains of is by the hand of a "heathen power" (Smith, *Twelve Prophets*, 124).

32 Cf. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 465–66.

revealing that he will use an enemy of Israel—a non-Israelite nation—in his redemptive-historical plan. The Lord’s words to Habakkuk, though likely difficult ones, are not callous but should be viewed as words from a Lord who does not need to reveal these things but does so out of care vis-a-vis the cry of his prophet (and probably also of his people).³³

11.b *A Universal “Work” of the Lord*

Following the Hebrew, LXX-Habakkuk emphasizes by repetition what the audience of the prophet will see. The Lord asks them to understand that he will soon be “working a work in your days” (ἐργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν; cf. the MT: כִּי־פַעַל פַּעַל).³⁴ The responsibility for the action that God will reveal to Habakkuk is taken entirely by the Lord.³⁵ He is the source of the power of this foreign nation and the ultimate agent of judgment.

In two places of the prophecy, the Lord is said to “work.” This important verb emphasizes the Lord’s action in history for his plan and its relation to his using a non-Israelite nation to accomplish his plan. Andersen observes that “in Hab 3:2, [there is found] an important link between the two parts of the prophecy. The conquest of the world by Babylon was actually an act of God.” In both 3:2 and 1:5 [namely, 1:5a and 1:5b], it is the Lord’s “work”³⁶ that brings to light the surprising revelation that the Lord was behind the victory and might of enemy nations. Indeed, this would have been marvelous but marvelous in a surprising way.

11.c *Summary: the Universal Plan of the Lord Revealed*

As observed, 1:5, and the rest of the Lord’s response to Habakkuk’s first complaint in 1:5–11, is simple in its message. However, despite its simple message, its place in Habakkuk’s prophecy is important. It is a clear response that does not clearly respond to the prophet’s complaint, and raises more questions for the prophet and God’s people than it immediately provides answers. By having

33 For similar reasons to those doubt can be cast upon Andersen’s view on the tone of the Lord’s words in 1:5–11, as well as Balentine’s (*Prayer*, 185) assessment that “the opening words of God’s announcement ... elicit a response seemingly opposite to that which God intended.”

34 The work the Lord is revealing to Habakkuk is a future one (contra, Balentine, *Prayer*, 184), though according to the understanding of the prophet, it may be an immanent work (cf. Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 143).

35 Balentine, *Prayer*, 183–84.

36 In the MT, the connection is between the verb פַּעַל, while in LXX-Hab it is the between the uses of ἐργον.

his sights lifted, Habakkuk is sent to further inquiry and complaint. Balentine says that the immediate context shows this:

The response that does follow [1:5–11] is a second lament (1:12–17), which continues the initial complaint. If God's response to the earlier lament is intended as an answer or a rebuttal to Habakkuk's charges, it has not yet secured his submission.³⁷

God's response to Habakkuk could, in many ways, be looked upon as redirecting the question of oppression brought up by the prophet, and, in this way, God's first response is programmatic for this present prophecy. Without the many questions it raises, the severity of the truth of what is coming, and the source of its judgment, there would be no need for further dialogue between the prophet and his Lord in order to clarify the situation. Andersen importantly suggests a higher purpose for God's revelation of a judgment by a nation that is against his people, though not a new action by the Lord: "This 'deed' [of Hab. 1:5] of God constitutes a crisis of faith for the believer, not an invitation to faith for the unbeliever."³⁸ The opinion of Andersen is probably valid. How will Israel believe (once again) that their Lord is using their enemy to judge wickedness among them? This fact may be clarified by Hab. 2:4, but this is an entirely different discussion. Suffice it to say, the prophecy of Habakkuk is a rare look behind the scenes into the interaction of the prophet and the Lord that seeks to explain a redemptive-historical crisis. However, burdened by the Lord's choice to accomplish his plan with a foreign nation, the first response of the Lord, in 1:5 only adds to the strain and leads to further discussion that will be carried forward in the rest of the prophecy.

III The Work of God: the Role of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13

The quotation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 appears in Acts 13:41 at the end of the Lukan Paul's first speech to those "Men of Israel" and "God fearers" in Antioch of Pisidia which began in 13:26.³⁹ The quotation is nearly verbatim from the LXX. Only by subtle edits (probably to limit redundancy as noted in 11.a) does Luke

³⁷ Balentine, *Prayer*, 185.

³⁸ Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 144.

³⁹ Marshall, *Acts of the Apostles*, 225; Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 2026. For more on the structure of the speech, see Robert F. O'Toole, "Christ's Resurrection in Acts 13, 13–52," *Bib* 3 (1979): 336.

depart from the LXX in his appropriation of this text.⁴⁰ It is, however, by the addition of ἔργον that Luke illuminates his purpose for using Hab. 1:5 amid the two speeches of Paul at this stage of Acts.⁴¹

Luke's quotation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 is thus,

Behold, you scoffers, be astounded and perish. For I am working⁴² a work (ἔργον ἐργάζομαι) in your days, a work (ἔργον) that you will not believe, even if one tells it to you.⁴³

The role of Hab. 1:5 rests heavily upon the Lukan emphasis of “work” (ἔργον).⁴⁴ In Acts 13:41, a Lukan addition⁴⁵ emphasizes “work” by inserting ἔργον in the last phrase of the quotation (ἔργον ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἕάν τις ἐκδιηγῇται ὑμῖν.).⁴⁶

III.a “The Work” as the Gospel for the Nations

The weight of ἔργον as the main point of difference between the normative and the quoted material, textually speaking, has not been the point of debate concerning the Lukan appropriation of Hab. 1:5 (since most agree that this is a

40 Steyn, *Quotations*, 190.

41 As already frequently noted, Luke is reading a specific “LXX” text; namely, a proto-Alexandrian ‘LXX’ text form. Because of our certainty of this *Vorlage*, we can know that ἔργον is from Luke and not from another Greek text. This is an important reminder of what we set out in our introduction, namely, that Luke’s specific normative text form is defined well enough that we can identify and study intentional interpretive points of departure that are uniquely Lukan readings of the quoted text. The Lukan addition of ἔργον is an important example of such active reading.

42 It is intentional that ἐργάζομαι is translated here as “to accomplish” or “to do” as many English translations have. Their translation is better prose, but we want to observe with emphasis the thrice occurring “work” words that appear in a relatively small space, and thus bring out the Lukan emphasis on “work” more clearly.

43 See section II.a for the minor differences between the normative text of LXX-Hab. 1:5 and the Lukan version.

44 Cf. e.g., R. W. Wall, “The Function of LXX Habakkuk 1:5 in the Book of Acts,” *BBR* 10 (2000): 251; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 460–62; Steyn, *Quotations*, 190.

45 Steyn (*Quotations*, 190) notes, forcefully,

“It is clear that there is no intertextual evidence that this addition might be due to some source text of Lk (at least those known and available today). There is no single witness in the LXX tradition which supports the inclusion of this word here. It can be therefore relatively safely assumed that Luke has consciously added this himself on stylistic ground for sake of clarity.”

46 The appearance of ἔργον in this phrase is in addition to the two previous forms of this word earlier in the quotation (ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν). Van de Sandt adds, as we might expect, that this repetition “has been inserted purposefully” by Luke to give “extra weight” to “work” (“A Reflection,” 45).

Lukan addition). But in order to amplify the "history of interpretation" covered in the introduction of this chapter; we will look closer at *the referent* of ἔργον since this is the part that is debated. The word ἔργον is what holds the key to the meaning of the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5, and this is where scholarship is in disagreement and where it has likely obfuscated, the important turning point that Luke is now explaining, his context by use of this LXX-TP quotation.

Two major stances have been taken on this issue and one minority view.

(1) The first of these views is the commonly held belief that ἔργον is in exclusive reference to some aspect of Christology. Within this category are two very similar views that can be difficult to differentiate since one sees ἔργον as the work of God through Christ, and the other is the proclamation of the work of God through Christ.

It is most commonly held that the "work" here refers to all of God's work through Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension as Lord and Messiah.⁴⁷ Others have seen "work" as referring to only a single work, namely the resurrection,⁴⁸ but this view often has been rejected.⁴⁹ For the proponents of this view, the nature of the "work" that is predicted as being astonishing to and rejected by the Jewish and God-fearing on-lookers in the LXX-Hab. 1:5 quotation is the work of God in Jesus as savior.⁵⁰ Barrett represents this view, saying, "The ἔργον that God has worked is that which he has done in Christ; and the unbelief of Israel, their rejection of God's work, had been foretold."⁵¹ For Johnson, who calls this a "self-fulfilling prophecy"⁵² as does Barrett, the Jewish rejection is what is fulfilled in Acts 13 and elucidated by Hab. 1:5 leading to the Gentile reception of the gospel. God's work through Jesus as the Lord and Christ, as Acts 2 announces, and the Jews reject this work, thus fulfilling LXX-Hab. 1:5. This view would create a causal link between the refusal of the Jewish people to "respond to Jesus" and the mission to the Gentiles that is simply not present in this passage.⁵³

47 Barrett, *Acts: 1-14*, 652. Cf. also, Steyn, *Quotations*, 186, 193; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 460-61 Keener, *Acts: 3:1-14:28*, 2090-91.

48 C. A. J. Pillai, *Apostolic Interpretation of History—A Commentary on Acts 13:16-41* (Hicksville: Exposition, 1980), 72-73.

49 Cf. e.g., Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 461.

50 Johnson, *Acts*, 243. Johnson's referent is incorrect, which will be given more attention below. However, elsewhere in his commentary he correctly applies this theme of "self-fulfilling prophecy" in Acts 7 (cf. *Acts*, 142).

51 Barrett, *Acts: 1-14*, 652.

52 Johnson, *Acts*, 236.

53 Cf. John Nolland, "Salvation-History and Eschatology," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,

With a slight difference from the first view, others prefer to think that ἔργον is in reference to the apostolic preaching or proclamation of God's work through Jesus.⁵⁴ Shepherd calls the Lukan use of Hab. 1:5 a "call to faith."⁵⁵ However, Shepherd's understanding of the quotation is far too influenced by what seems to be a yet-to-be-proven imposition of the Pauline use of δίκαιόω upon the Lukan use in 13:38–39 and its relation to the quotation.⁵⁶

(2) The second major view is that ἔργον is in reference to the Gentile mission. In this view, the audience is called to be astonished that Jesus is Lord and Messiah over the Gentiles as he is over the Jews. Van de Sandt says, "... Luke's duplication of [ἔργον] in the Habakkuk quotation is meant to stress ... the astonishment about God's work [in] the mission to the Gentiles."⁵⁷ In contrast to the last view, this view sees ἔργον pointing forward to the explanation found in the Isaianic prophecy in Acts 13:47, namely that God's work in Jesus points to a planned initiative towards Gentiles *as Gentiles* and not back to the Davidic prophecy in 13:26–37 which would essentially be a repetition of the previous public proclamations in Acts.

(3) A third minor view has been suggested by Stählin. His view is that ἔργον refers to "world mission" or the "last things."⁵⁸ Barrett suggests that parallels to this view can be found in 1QpHab 2.1–10, but that this source makes no mention of Gentiles.⁵⁹ This view seems too broad to be helpful to this specific context and intertextual use, and it is simply hard to substantiate this claim.

Tied up in this debate, specifically between the two majority views, is Luke's goal in reporting Paul's two speeches and how he seeks to move Acts forward. By highlighting ἔργον in his appropriation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 with clear emphasis,

1998), 76–81. Nolland's view is closely tied to the conclusions at which this present study arrives concerning the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Hab. 1:5.

54 Dunn, *Acts*, 181–82; Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 414.

55 Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 47.

56 Cf. Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 47–52. Shepherd's method of investigation of the Lukan text is also hamstrung by continuing to privilege the MT over the LXX, as the text of choice of Luke, and the Habakkuk context over the Lukan one. For a closer look at the relationship between the Lukan Paul's direct missionary speeches and the Pauline epistles, see Armin Baum, "Paulinismen in Den Missionsreden Des Lukanischen Paulus: Zur Inhaltlichen Authentizität der Oratio Recta in der Apostelgeschichte," *ETL* 82, no. 4 (2006): 405–36.

57 van de Sandt, "A Reflection," 45. Cf. also, Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 208 and David A. de Silva, "Paul's Sermon in Antioch of Pisidia," *BibSac* 151 (1994): 48.

58 G. Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 185.

59 Barrett, *Acts: 1–14*, 653. Bock (*Acts*, cf. 461) notes other views on the matter at hand, but these views fall generally under the first majority view, which is Bock's view.

it is assumable that Luke intends this Scripture to play a key role in clarifying the actions of God in Acts 13 and its literary context in Acts. With regard to the role LXX-Hab. 1:5 plays in Acts 13, the question that should be asked is: Does Luke intend to read LXX-Hab. 1:5 with relationship to God's work in making Jesus the Lord and Messiah? If this is so, as the first view would have it, the Lukan appropriation of Hab. 1:5 is placing the burden upon the first speech of Paul, its emphasis upon the fulfillment of the Davidic dynasty in Jesus, and finally its rejection.

Two problems, however, exist with this suggestion: (1) No one, as reported by Luke in Acts 13, seems to be the least bit astonished or scandalized by the content of the first speech of Paul which is Paul's proclamation of what God has made Jesus, Lord and Christ. There is simply a warm reception of this news according to 13:42–43. (2) Such proclamation, for the student of Acts, naturally would not be and still is not astonishing if the referent of "work" is to the proclamation of God making Jesus Lord. It is simply old news, if not redundant. There must be something else that is "astonishing" and the "scandal" must be found elsewhere that finds its referent in "work" from LXX-Hab. 1:5.

It is the second view that involves a more progressive reading—one that situates the reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in its proper tension and places it in its rightful place at an important redemptive-historical context in Acts.

By LXX-Hab. 1:5 and its strongly-worded tone, Luke is emphasizing a new stage of his narrative. His appropriation of Hab. 1:5 places the burden upon what is made explicit in Paul's second speech, which is in fact no speech at all but a report of a speech and of the jealous reaction of the Jews in Antioch to the reception of the gospel by those who are from "nearly all of the city [of Antioch] (σχεδὸν πάντα ἡ πόλις)." Luke seems to be suggesting by his reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 that the "work" that is rejected (and therefore, that which is "self-fulfilled," as per Johnson—*pace* his referent) is that God has done a work making Jesus Messiah and Lord for *all people*, for Jews *and for Gentiles qua Gentiles*.

Some contextual clues make the case clearer that Luke's appropriation of Hab. 1:5 is to reveal, for the first time to groups of people, that Jesus is the universal Lord and Messiah (i.e., for the first time to the Gentile God-fearers of the first speech, the unqualified Gentiles of the second, and all Jews present at both). This exposes the "despisers" by a predicted and fulfilled explicit jealousy and rejection in Acts 13. These clues included the Lukan use of ἔργον in the context of the rest of Acts and the broader implications of the complexion of the Lukan Paul's respective audiences in his first and second speeches, their relation ethnically and religiously to the Mosaic Law mentioned in 13:38, and their varied reactions to Paul's message.

III.b *The Proper Referent of “The Work” as the Gospel for the Nations*

If it is true that ἔργον holds the key to the role of Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13 and its Lukan appropriation into this context, the use of ἔργον elsewhere in Acts is vital to observe.

In Acts, the word ἔργον is used a few other times in its singular form, and when used this way, it is in all but one case in explicit reference to the apostles and the Gentile mission.⁶⁰ In Acts 13:2, which is the precursor to Paul’s and Barnabas’ Antioch visit, Luke reports, “And while they were worshipping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, ‘Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work (τὸ ἔργον) to which I have called them.’” Later in 14:26, Luke says,

... and from there [Paul and Barnabas] sailed to Antioch, where they had been committed to the grace of God for the work [τὸ ἔργον] that they had fulfilled. And when they arrived and gathered the church together, they declared all that God had done with them, and how he had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles.

And finally, in 15:38, after the Jerusalem Council that officially commissioned the Gentile mission from the young church, Luke reports that Paul and Barnabas are back in Antioch having a dispute over the place of John Mark in their “work,” saying, “but Paul thought best not to take with them one who had withdrawn from them in Pamphylia and had not gone with them to the work [τὸ ἔργον]. And there arose a sharp disagreement ...”

The only other time ἔργον appears in Acts is in the words of Gamaliel (5:38), who says,

if this counsel or this work [τὸ ἔργον] is of men, it will fail; but if it of God you will not be able to overthrow them [that is the preaching of the apostles]. You might even be found to oppose God.

In the greater context, the use of τὸ ἔργον by Gamaliel could plausibly be applied to the mission of God to the Gentiles⁶¹ since Luke probably casts Gamaliel’s words in the same stream as that of the universal mission predicted in Acts 1:8, and certainly with reference to the proclamation of Jesus as Lord of the Jews according to the apostolic preaching. But the other instances are

60 van de Sandt, “A Reflection,” 45; cf. also, Wall, “Function,” 251. ἔργον appears once in its singular (dative) form in Luke’s gospel in description of Jesus in response to Cleopas on the road to Emmaus.

61 Some have gone to great lengths to demonstrate that Acts 5:38 is, in fact, in reference to the Gentile mission. But their cases rely too heavily on contexts outside of the Lukan one, and are in the end too speculative. Cf. van de Sandt, “A Reflection,” 45–47.

much clearer in their intention and give good reason to believe that Luke was purposeful in Acts for what he wanted the ἔργον to refer to verbally, namely, God's plan for all people to be his people including those of non-Jewish nations in their own right.

III.C *Three Observations about the Lukan Paul's Audience(s) and the Mosaic Law*

Understanding the appropriation of Hab. 1:5 has a lot to do with the audience, Luke supposes for Paul in his two speeches. Regrettably, this aspect has been scantily attended to. For Luke, the referent to ἔργον, either to the proclamation of Jesus or to the Gentile mission, is tied up in the make-up of the crowd and what their response is to this revealed "work." Three things make this clear.

III.C.1 The Referent of ἔργον and LXX-Hab. 1:5

First, what one believes the "Jews" are reacting to in Acts 13 says a lot about what they believe ἔργον means. The view that Hab. 1:5 and the "work" it foretells is used by Luke to refer to God's "work" in making Jesus the Lord and Messiah suggests that the Jews are demonstrating their continued callousness to the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus by another display of rejection of this news. This view would see Hab. 1:5 as proclaiming a work in a way that is used by the Lukan Paul as a "call to faith" or a warning not to refuse belief in Jesus; a warning not heeded according to this view. For this view, Bruce articulates how the Jews reacted. He says,

In Acts 13:40–41 Paul, concluding his synagogue address at Pisidian Antioch, warns his incredulous hearers [with Hab 1:5]. In these successive situations people dismissed the likelihood of God's acting in the way announced and had to be reproached for their unbelief.⁶²

As noted at length earlier, the major problem that exists with this stance is that immediately following the Lukan account of Paul's first speech, the only reaction given by the crowd is a positive one. Luke says in the verses between Paul's two speeches (13:42–43),

As they exited, the people urged that these things might be told them the next Sabbath. And after the synagogue meeting dispersed, many Jews and devout converts to Judaism followed Paul and Barnabas, who, as they spoke with them, urged them to continue in the grace of God.

62 Bruce, "Habakkuk," 847. This view has its roots at least as far back as Calvin (cf. *Twelve Prophets*, 26).

Luke is clear in 13:16 and 13:26 that Paul is speaking to Jews and Gentiles who have at some level adopted the heritage of Judaism. Acts 13:42–43 says that among these same people (meaning, that they are still made up of the same ethnic complexion) is *only* a positive reception of the proclamation of Jesus as Davidic Messiah. Is the warning in the Lukan appropriation of Hab. 1:5, therefore, in reference to the content of Paul's first speech? According to the reaction of the crowd in 13:42–43, this does not seem to be the case. So who are the despisers and what is the "work" they despise if it is not God's work in making Jesus Messiah and Lord, as per the Lukan Paul's speech?

In fact, there is only one negative reaction that is to be found in Acts 13, and it is in relation to Paul's second speech. The negative reaction is of the Jews to the crowds drawn by Paul and Barnabas the next week. According to the Lukan Paul, the work is Jesus being proclaimed as the "light for the Gentiles" who "bring[s] salvation to the ends of the earth"; that is to all people equally. In fact, it is interesting to note that Luke does not even report a speech in the 13:44–47 pericope. He reports the jealousy of the Jews to the multi-national crowds gathered to hear Paul's speech at the next Sabbath and Paul's retort to that jealousy. No speech, in fact, in Paul's visit to the location of the previous week's speech has either begun or ended. It is only by virtue of who is present to listen to Paul's second address to a crowd in Pisidian Antioch, and what he will soon proclaim, that the Jews and God-fearers alike react with such astonished jealousy. Here we find the fulfillment of LXX-Hab. 1:5 according to Luke:

The next Sabbath almost the whole city gathered to hear the word of the Lord. But when the Jews saw the crowds, they were filled with jealousy and began to contradict what was spoken by Paul, reviling him. And Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly, saying, "It was necessary that the word of God be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it aside and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we are turning to the Gentiles. For so the Lord has commanded us, saying,

I have made you a light for the Gentiles,
that you may bring salvation to the ends of the earth.

Acts 13:44–47; ESV

In Acts 13:48–50, the Gentiles celebrated this news, but the Jews stirred up a persecution against Paul and Barnabas.⁶³ Importantly, in 13:44–47, the Jews

63 The persecution of Paul and Barnabas that relates to their message of Jesus as the savior of all people begins at the end of Acts 13. In fact, the persecution continues in 14:1 for the same message. And, some of the Antiochean Jews follow Paul and Barnabas to Lystra and

are said to reject the announcement of a work of God that was proclaimed by Paul and Barnabas at the command of God (cf. 13:47). And they reject this work directly by rejecting the Gentiles as those who are revealed at this moment as worthy receptors of the gospel without circumcision and association to the synagogue. This is a reality that is beyond the plausibility structure of those Jews and God-fearers (i.e., those devoted to the Law of Moses, and by virtue, the synagogue), beyond what the Lord would plan for or do within their eschatological and ecclesiological framework—truly astonishing! Of course, it is almost self-evidently true that such a reality bears distinct resemblance to the prediction given at the end of the Lukan Paul's first speech, by LXX-Hab. 1:5.

III.C.2 Synagogue Association and LXX-Hab. 1:5

Secondly, the difference in audience make-up between the first and second speech is important in understanding the place of Hab. 1:5 in its Lukan context. There is an association with the synagogue that matters when considering the way that this text is being read and how it relates to both speeches of Paul.

A further observation is made by van de Sandt concerning the make-up of the second audience before Paul. He says,

A week later, on the next Sabbath, 'almost the whole city gathered together' (v. 44). This phrase suggests that the audience is not made up of Jews and God-fearing people alone, as was the case in 13, 16–41 [those at Paul's first speech and indeed those who invited Paul back the next week, and joined Paul immediately after his first speech for more], but that a large number of Gentiles was present as well, which is confirmed in vv. 46–48.⁶⁴

Correctly, van de Sandt notices the intentional change in audience make-up by Luke. It is likely, therefore, that the crowd was made up of Jews, God-fearing Gentiles, and Gentiles who had not previously converted to Judaism.⁶⁵ The unregulated (according to the regulations that the synagogue would put upon non-Jewish adherents) proclamation of the Davidic Messiah to those who had never made any profession of belief or obedience to Jewish law is clearly the immediate referent of the jealousy expressed by the Jews in 13:45. Simply

stone them (cf. 14:19). This continued persecution may be an important observation in that it makes the appropriation of Hab. 1:5 have a wider narrative application than simply to the crowd in 13, which is how it should be viewed, in fact.

64 van de Sandt, "A Reflection," 50.

65 Cf. Schnabel, *Mission*, 1491; J. Polhill, "Antioch's Contribution to Christianity," *Faith and Mission* 18 (2000): 3–20. For a more general description of the population in Asia Minor, and parts relevant to Antioch, cf. Levinskaya, *Diaspora Setting*, 138–43.

stated, those unassociated with the synagogue should not hear and receive the gospel proclamation or name the Jewish Lord and messiah their Lord. The fact that they now do it because they can is the prediction of this text, according to Luke's reading.

III.C.3 The Law of Moses and LXX-Hab. 1:5

Finally, the phrase νόμῳ Μωϋσέως in Acts 13 has an essential relationship to the Gentile mission in the rest of Acts, and how it forecasts the fulfillment of Hab. 1:5 as Acts 13 comes to an end. It is presumable that association with the synagogue carries with it an expectation of submission to the Jewish law, the Law of Moses (cf. Acts 13:38–39). The context of the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 makes the Mosaic Law an important factor in what is astonishing in the Lord's work among a foreign people and to this people's reception of Jesus as Lord.

In five places in Acts, "the Law of Moses" or "customs of Moses" are referenced. Twice it is referred to as the "customs of Moses" (6:14, τὰ ἔθνη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς; 15:1, τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωϋσέως), and in the three remaining occasions it is referred to as "the Law of Moses" (13:39, ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως δικαιωθῆναι; 15:5, δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς [the Gentile converts] παραγγέλλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως; 28:23, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν).

In the former instances, the words are found on the lips of the accusers of the proclamation of the apostles. First, they are in response to the proclamation by Stephen and the apostles' likeness of Jesus to Moses. The second time they are said by an unnamed group of "some men [who] came down from Judea" (τινες κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας) who taught that for one to be a follower of Jesus one must be circumcised according to the "customs of Moses" which of course is what precipitates and directly precedes the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 (and has a secure connection to the pericope currently under investigation).

The latter three occurrences of "the Law of Moses" strongly relate to Gentiles and their reception of Jesus as Lord and Messiah. The second of these occasions in Acts 15:5 occurs in the context that immediately refers to the requirements for Gentile converts to the young church and is a contextual reference to James' exegesis of Amos 9:11–12, which gives a scriptural warrant for Gentile inclusion *qua* Gentiles. The first and third occasions (Acts 13:39, 28:23) contextually precede Isaianic prophecies relating to the mission to the Gentiles. In the case of Acts 13:39, the Lukan Paul quotes Is. 49:6 in 13:47, which speaks of the Messiah as the light to the Gentiles. By contrast, after expounding the Scriptures of "Law of Moses" and "the prophets" reported in Acts 28:23–24, Paul quotes Isaiah 6:9–10 which reveals the Jewish callousness as a fulfilled

prophecy. For Luke, this gives Paul the warrant to speak of his mission to the Gentiles (28:28). On both of these occasions, "the Law of Moses" is contextually tied to an explicitly adverse reaction by the Jewish audience (13:45; 28:25a) and an explicit claim of God's plan for the Gentile reception (13:48; 28:28b). The quotation of Isaiah 6:9–10 in Acts 28 echoes much of the same message as Hab. 1:5 and its literary context in Acts by demonstrating it has been God's work by his apostles to go to all people with the salvation that is made available in Jesus, going to the Jews first with the intention of going to the Gentiles with the same message. From his first sermon to his last one reported in Acts, the Lukan Paul continues to proclaim Jesus as Lord and Messiah and from first to last, the Jews continue to affirm to him the Jewish jealous reaction that it has reached God's assigned time for the Gentiles by the Jewish jealous rejection.⁶⁶

Additionally, there is a meaningful relationship to observe between the first and second occasion of "the Law of Moses" in Acts 13 and 15. Both deal with the freedom or obligation which the Gentiles would potentially have in relation to the "Law of Moses." In both cases, 13:38–41 and 15:5–10, freedom from the law is proposed by the apostles in light of Scriptural warrant. In 13:38–40, the use of οὖν has a vital role in prefiguring what will be proclaimed in the Lukan use of Hab. 1:5 and fulfilled just verses later. The Lukan Paul says,

Let it be known to you, *therefore* [οὖν], brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you, and by him everyone who believes is justified from everything from which you could not be freed by the Law of Moses. Beware, *therefore* [οὖν], lest what is said in the Prophets should come about [Hab. 1:5 quotation]

Some have placed an undue burden in this passage upon the two occurrences of "justification" by emphasizing issues of justification by faith. This issue is not in view for Luke here.⁶⁷ Instead, the placements of οὖν highlight what is

66 Of course, the observation of the phrase "the Law of Moses" is not to get into the larger discussion of the law in Luke-Acts. It is rather noted in order to observe, at least verbally, its exclusive literary association with concerns of the Gentile mission, and its clear differentiation from its other Lukan form, "the customs of Moses," that is spoken by opponents of the plan of God according to Acts.

67 In this pericope, Bates ("A Note on Acts, 13:39," in *SE*, ed. E. A. Livingstone [Berlin: Akademik Verlag, 1973], 110) says that 7:39 is not a "complete of exact summary of the doctrine of justification by faith." At this point, one might agree with Bates, because Luke's point here is hardly to expose fully the doctrine of justification by faith, though some have tried to make it thus (cf. e.g., Shepherd, 48). However, others have also attempted to do what Bates does next, namely, harmonize this sentence with other Pauline statements. Bates continues, "The writer would seem to be of the opinion that the Law of Moses will

at stake for Luke—namely, the relationship between the requirements of the Law of Moses and salvation by Messiah Jesus and what that says about God's "work." The Lukan Paul's audience at the point of this saying is made up of Jews *but also of Gentiles* who have adopted the heritage of Israel, which of course includes some level of law observance; the Gentile God-fearers were acceptable to the synagogue only according to certain levels of obedience to the Law of Moses. It is clear that many of the Gentiles assumed to have heard the second speech of the Lukan Paul had not all made the same commitments: they had not at any level submitted to the law. Certainly, for both audiences, those associated with the Jewish heritage and those who were not, such news would be quite new and astounding with reference to the Lukan narrative and with reference to redemptive-history.

Concerning the hearing of the first audience, this news and "work" would prepare a way in which they could be free from the law as the synagogue imposed it. And for the second crowd, they could receive freedom by the forgiveness offered in Jesus, never being under this "yoke" (cf. 15:10), *qua* Gentiles. This is the "work" that scandalized the Jews in the second speech in Antioch and this is how Luke reads this text as being fulfilled in this momentous turning point in redemptive-history and in his narrative.

Critical to this case is that it seems Luke is using the two instances of οὖν in 13:38–40 to make a parenthetical statement⁶⁸ that emphasizes freedom from the Law of Moses by believing in Jesus. The rhetorical role of οὖν connects the freedom from the Law of Moses as offered by salvation in Jesus to the "work" of God in Hab. 1:5, which is that Jesus is Messiah and Lord *and Savior of all people*, regardless of commitment to the law already taken (in the case of the God-fearers) or not taken (in the case of the rest of the Gentiles in setting of the second speech). The debate concerning how free a Gentile truly is from the law begins here, or maybe it is better to speak of it as being foreshadowed here; it is one that will not be resolved until the gathering of the leaders in Acts 15 in

justify you from some things but not from all [with Witherington, *Acts*, 413]. Where the Mosaic Law falls short, belief in Jesus takes over and will see you through. This is not Paul's own view of things." In making too much of this instance of "justification," Bates misses the Lukan emphasis, and has to conclude that this statement must have been a Pauline-esque afterthought later appended to the kerygma (110). For more on the overlap of Pauline theology with this pericope, cf. de Silva, "Paul's Sermon," 46–47. Conzelmann (*Acts*, 106), however, is correct in calling ἀφεσις ἀμαρτιῶν "non-Pauline," rather inferring it is more Lukan-Petrine. Baum ("Oratio Recta in der Apostelgeschichte," 414) is probably more correct to say that 13:26–39 has no direct parallel to the Pauline letters, but more closely recalls Peter's earlier preaching in Acts 2 (2:25–32).

68 Steyn, *Quotations*, Cf. 186.

Jerusalem.⁶⁹ In Acts 13:38–39, more specifically, Luke prepares for the proper understanding of his appropriation of Hab. 1:5 and the “work” it elucidates.

Likewise, the instance of “the Law of Moses” in 15:5–10 does not concern justification by faith, but what the lordship of Jesus means for the freedom of the Gentiles from the law. John Nolland has argued convincingly that the “yoke” of the “Law of Moses,” spoken of in Acts 15:10, is to be understood as two things:⁷⁰ (1) positively, as a “yoke” that is gladly taken on by an Israelite (that is, not an oppressive burden), yet one that Israel has failed to carry; (2) a “yoke” that Old Testament history suggests Israel did not have the strength to carry; Luke’s Jewish contemporaries affirm this as a continuous biblical pattern. The importance of this observation by Nolland is that it has been suggested that the Lukan view (or, Lukan Peter’s view, in this instance) of the law is one of an outsider, namely a Hellenistic Gentile Christian view that sees the law as “a mass of commandments and prohibitions which no man can fulfill.”⁷¹ So for Nolland it seems, this view would make Luke articulate things about the law which neither the Old Testament, nor any of his Jewish contemporaries, nor probably even his missionary colleagues, would have said about it. Nolland successfully corrects this view and returns credibility to Luke and his narrative argument (which in important ways is tied to the exposition and correct understanding of the fulfillment of the Law of Moses). In the end, the appearance of the “Law of Moses” in these two occurrences has integral connection to the “work” God is doing, as declared in Hab. 1:5, namely that the Gentiles would be welcomed *qua* Gentiles in freedom from the Law of Moses, a law which, though gladly taken on by the Jewish people, has been unsuccessfully borne by them.

III.d Summary

This section has considered the place of Hab. 1:5 in the Lukan appropriation for his account of the speeches of Paul in Acts 13. Luke uses the quotation with great verbal similarity to its LXX source. However, one addition is important: the Lukan insertion of ἔργον. Luke’s appropriation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 and emphasis of “work” in Acts 13:41 direct the reader of Acts to a “work” that Luke seeks to illuminate and clarify by his use of Hab. 1:5. The “work” is the proclamation and reception of Jesus as the Lord and Christ over *all people* which places special emphasis on the revealing of God’s work in the universal, uncircumcised Gentile mission to a corporate audience.

69 Wall, “Function.”

70 John Nolland, “A Fresh Look at Acts 15.10,” *NTS* 27 (1981).

71 Haenchen, *Acts*, 446 n3. Cf. also, Conzelmann, *Acts*, 106.

Despite a majority who believes that the “work” in Hab. 1:5 is used to refer to the announcement of God’s work in Jesus as the “work” that is foretold to be rejected and not believed, the text of Acts 13, (specifically 13:38–52 which is the end of Paul’s first speech through the account of the following Sabbath), suggests otherwise. Instead in order to capture the Lukan appropriation of Hab. 1:5 in its fullest hermeneutical significance, it must be viewed as read by Luke in order to predict the “work” of God amidst a foreign nation in significant continuity with the message that astounded the inscripturated prophet himself. Specifically for the Lukan reading of this text in Acts 13, God’s work amidst this foreign nation is to bring them *qua* Gentiles into his own people and under the lordship of his anointed Lord and Christ, free from the Law of Moses.

In sum, the earlier view fails at important points to apprehend the weight of the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in this context and its turning point in the redemptive-history in Acts. The view simply repeats known knowledge, which is at its core counter-productive and simply not astonishing. Such “news” would no longer astound the first-time reader of Acts, and in the end does not properly account for the contextual and literary setting of this quotation. Only the understanding of Hab. 1:5 as relating to a mission oriented to the uncircumcised Gentiles properly grasps the purpose of this quotation in the progression of the narrative of Acts which is foreshadowing a universally represented church. This is a universal church that will be given full authentication in Acts 15 (importantly, by the Lukan construal of another LXX-Book-of-the-Twelve quotation from Amos 9:11–12 in his own version of the ordering of the TP; Joel, Amos, Habakkuk, Amos).

IV “The Traitors in the Latter Days”: the Reading of Hab. 1:5 by 1QpHab 1.16–2.10

The Pesher Habakkuk reads the prophet Habakkuk in light of an eschatological conflict between a figure known as the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 1.13; 2.2; 5.9–12; 7.4–5; 8.3; 9.9–12; 11.4–8) and those who betray the law and covenant of God (cf. 1QpHab 1.10; 2.4).⁷² This group is known as the “Traitors” (2.1, 3, 5) and is represented by two adversaries to the interpretation of The

72 Devorah Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen; Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress, 1984), 509.

Teacher of Righteousness, namely the Man of Lies⁷³ and the Wicked Priest. The relationship between those who follow the interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Traitors who do not sets the stage for the eschatological interpretation of Hab. 1.5⁷⁴ and God's punishment of these traitors by a foreign nation. Fabry correctly observes that "the 'in our days' (Hab 1.5) seems to call [sic] for a Qumranic application of Habakkuk's message to the Qumran sects own time."⁷⁵

IV.a *The Text of 1QpHab. 1.16–2.10*

The reading and appropriation of Hab. 1:5 comes to us in a slightly fragmented form in 12 lines from 1QpHab. 1.16–2.10.⁷⁶ Textually speaking, it is hard to know how much 1QpHab 1:16–2:1 varies from a normative text it is interpreting since the brackets indicate that the Hebrew is reconstructed. One reconstruction is generally agreed-upon, however. 1QpHab 1:16 probably begins with "Look, O traitors, and see ..." This is supposed, against the MT's "Look among the nations," because of its context. According to the setting for which the writer of 1QpHab was appropriating Habakkuk, the conflict between the Teacher of Righteousness and the traitors to God's covenant spoken of in 1QpHab. 2:1 was central. Most scholars, therefore, believe that 1QpHab 1:16 should align more closely to the "LXX" that has οἱ καταφρονῆται ("scoffers") with "you traitors" who are being called to lift their eyes to the judgment coming their way, similarly to the Greek OT.⁷⁷ The shift from "scoffers" to "traitors" is an interpretive move by the author as line eleven makes clear by saying, "The interpretation of the word concerns the traitors in the last days."

73 The Man of Lies is also suspected to be the same as the Spouter of Lies in 1QpHab 10:9–13, and possibly even the Man of Scorn in CD 1:14 (Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 509). Some have made attempts to find a historical referent to the Man of Lies. One of the more credible is Stegemann (*Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Trüfuer und Jesus* [Freiburg: Herder, 1996], 185) who made a sturdy case for the Sadducees.

74 Heinz-Josef Fabry, "The Reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields (Boston: Brill, 2003), 253; Steyn, *Quotations*, 193; Keener, *Acts: 3:1–14:28*, 2091.

75 Fabry, "Reception," 253. Cf. also, Kim Jong-Hoon, "Intentionale Varianten der Habakukzitate Im Pesher Habakuk Rezeptionsästhetisch Untersucht," *Bib* 1 (2007): 37.

76 See "selected texts" in the appendices for translations of these lines from 1QpHab.

77 Cf. e.g., James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox, 1994), 160n20; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 106.

iv.b *Reading Habakkuk Apocalyptically: a Battle between Righteous and Evil*

The eschatological battle of the good, namely the Teacher of Righteousness, and the evil, the Traitors and those who represent them, is the context into which the writer of 1QpHab is reading Habakkuk. As noted already by Fabry, it is generally agreed upon that the pesher is a contemporary updating of Habakkuk for the community that the pesher writer writes for;⁷⁸ a setting for which the writer appropriates Habakkuk intentionally to paint this apocalyptic scene of a battle between two distinct parties in the mind of his readers. This battle is the context that sets the scene for the reading of the prophet. According to the writer of 1QpHab, one party holds a correct interpretation that understands the “work” God is engaged in, and a second party is guilty of ignorance and is morally judged as evil.

However, there is also a third party, the Kittim (מִיִּצְתָּכָה). For 1QpHab, the Chaldeans from Habakkuk are interpreted as the Kittim. Most agree that, for the pesher writer, this party in 1QpHab stands for the Romans. The term “Kittim” is adopted by 1QpHab from Num. 24:24, which in the prophecy of Balaam is a people that played a pivotal role in the last days.⁷⁹ In Daniel (11:30), the Kittim is applied to the Greeks. So “Kittim” appears to have a history of interpretation of its own for the most powerful foreign foe that threatens the safety and security of Israel. According to the reading of 1QpHab, the powerful nation of the Kittim and the Kittim for 1QpHab is believed to be working as God’s instrument of punishment upon the unfaithful. And for 1QpHab this powerful nation in its context is the Romans (cf. e.g., 1QpHab. 4.5, 10).⁸⁰ The Kittim is the foreign force the writer of 1QpHab believes God by his sovereignty will utilize to punish the traitors that disregard God’s law and covenant (1QpHab. 9.4–6). 1QpHab, specifically 2.11–6.12, describes the Kittim in their full military might more than in any other Pesher (cf. 1QpHab. 3–4; 6.1–12).

The context of 1 QpHab is one of a struggle between righteousness and unrighteousness. Into this setting the pesher reads this text and understands God’s work in their midst. Joon-Hoon observes the key role the Kittim plays vis-a-vis the conflict between the followers of the Teacher and the Traitors, saying,

78 Jong-Hoon, “Pesher Habakuk,” 36–37. Cf. also, Fabry, “Reception,” 253.

79 Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 510.

80 Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 510.

[The pesher-writer's] world of experience was determined by the conflict between the Teacher of Righteousness and his opponents, the wicked priests and false prophets, and by the terrible enemy Kittim or Romans.⁸¹

It is clear from the pesher that the Teacher's reception and appropriation of Habakkuk is at the heart of the writer's application of Hab. 1:5.

Interestingly, one should note the confidence of the reader in 1QpHab. In his interpretation, there seems to be a certainty about the righteous and the ones who err that only one who reads and receives a text can have, a certainty that Habakkuk, the inscripturated prophet, lacked.⁸² However, according to the way that the Teacher is perceived, he appears to have been given insight that only God had when interacting with Habakkuk, and this insight concerns the last days and the events of those days.

What characterizes the unrighteous is that they do not believe this Teacher, but another. The traitors, this text says, are led by the Man of Lies who does not supposedly "believe" (1QpHab 2.2) the interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness. It is from the mouth of this teacher that God has given "to foretell the fulfillment of all the words of his servants, the prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared all that is going to happen to his people Is[rael]"⁸³ in the last generation (2.7–10). In spite of the fact that "the work" of God mentioned in Hab. 1.5 is never addressed verbatim in the interpretation of 1QpHab, 1QpHab 2.10 implies that the work is directly connected to God's revelation to the teacher about what he will bring upon "his people Israel" (2.10) and the judgment upon the "traitors in the last days" (2.5–7) who are disobedient to the teacher. This punishment is by the Kittim, a Gentile (or non-Jewish) people, and by the power given to them by God.

Andersen has dismissed the interpretation of 1QpHab as simply a sectarian conflict between two rival Jewish sects.⁸⁴ According to this view, engaged in

81 Jong-Hoon, "Pesher Habakuk," 37.

82 Fabry, "Reception," 253. Cf. also Watson, *Paul*, 115.

83 Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999), 13.

84 Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 151. 1QpHab has not been the only community whose eschatological understanding has been taken as something far less than the reality they perceived. A majority opinion concerning the earliest Christians exists that supposes that the early Christians were a community that operated under the radar, as it were, in a world hostile to their message. However, like 1QpHab, the early Christian community worked under the assumption of eschatology. For both communities, it should not be missed that eschatology enables us to assume the community's concern for a broader, worldwide scope, beyond themselves, and the belief that the days they live in are momentous for all that live in them—those who of God's people and those who are not. Cf. Bruce W. Winter,

a tribal “squabble,” as per Andersen, the writer of 1QpHab places too great an emphasis on this division and loses the scope of the world-stage that is found in Habakkuk.⁸⁵ This may seem to be the case to one interpreting Habakkuk who is not living in the context of Qumran like Andersen (whose context is a Western, cosmopolitan 21st-century lifestyle). However, for the writer of the pesher, he reads Habakkuk believing it clarified, in fact exegetes, the events of his day that were of cosmic importance. Fabry helpfully says,

1 QpHab ... understands Habakkuk as referring to perseverance in the eschatological waiting period (II, 9–15 ...) and the necessity for the community to establish itself. For 1QpHab the foundation period of the community coincides with the eschatological situation ...⁸⁶

In light of the eschatological time in which this writer believed himself to be situated, therefore, either obedience or disobedience to God's covenant carried more weight than Andersen allows. Even if the modern student of 1QpHab cannot grasp the full scope of context into which this pesher speaks, we must not make the interpretive attempts of the Teacher smaller than their authorial-intended purposes. The reference to God's eschatological “work” in Hab. 1:5 was appropriated by 1QpHab, along with the rest of the first two chapters of Habakkuk, for the clarification of what the Qumran community believed to be the last generation, and what implications that had for the faithfulness one had to the covenant of God as revealed by the teacher, how the unfaithful were treated, and the purpose for which God made the Kittim powerful in the last days.

Grasping the work of God amidst the writer's context is full of eschatological importance to this community. The interpretation of Scripture in 1QpHab, in light of the significance of the historical moment in which they are situated, takes into account their knowledge of how the world and how God is ordering it vis-a-vis the Righteous Teacher and the punishment by an unrighteous nation to befall those who do not follow him. It is from this one Teacher that a greater understanding for this community is arrived at via the appropriation of the eschatological message of Habakkuk.

“The Public Honouring of Christian Benefactors: Romans 13:3 and 1 Peter 2:14–15,” *JSNT* 34 (1988): 95–97; Bruce W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (Grand Rapids; Carlisle: Eerdmans; Paternoster, 1994), passim.

85 Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 141.

86 Fabry, “Reception,” 253.

V Habakkuk 1:5 in 1QpHab and Acts 13: a Conversation among Readers

Both Luke in Acts 13 and 1QpHab appropriate Hab. 1:5. Read on its own terms, the normative text of Habakkuk 1:5 is a programmatic statement by the Lord for the rest of the prophecy. In dialogue with the Lord, the prophet Habakkuk complains of injustice and abuse at the hands of the lawless around him and God's people. In response, the Lord redirects the sights of the prophet to a coming judgment by a foreign nation. That nation that is not God's people will be used by God to judge the wickedness of his people. It is an astonishing act by the Lord, and one that sends the prophet reeling, asking further questions throughout the rest of the prophecy. However, it is this first programmatic answer by the Lord that is our focus since this is what Luke and 1QpHab share as a common reading focus.

The uses of Hab. 1:5 by both of our interlocutors, Luke and 1QpHab, are both exceptional examples of the reading of this text in Early Jewish and Christian milieu. First, this is the only use of this text in the NT corpus. Similarly, it is the only explicit use in early Jewish literature. It would seem to follow that the scant use of this text in each type of literature would lead to an investigation of what might be gleaned by the two different readings of the normative text, Hab. 1:5. This is what we have hoped to do above and continue in this interaction between interlocutors.

Most Lukan interpreters do not give the pesher text much attention at all, but others have not agreed that there is use in setting Luke in conversation with 1QpHab. One scholar who holds this view is Gert Steyn. Steyn says that he does not see the comparison of respective appropriation as fruitful because the authors are worlds apart. Concerning the prospect of a fruitful conversation between readers, he holds that "The contexts are different and their purposes too. The only similarity is the fact that [Luke and 1QpHab] quote from Hab."⁸⁷ In light of what the conversation between interlocutors demonstrates, that misses the point and misunderstands the dynamic process of reception that a normative text goes through. Simply said, a key principle of scriptural normativity is that the normative text is an expression of God's will for later generations who had not shared in the historical moment that is documented in the normative text.⁸⁸ Instead of Steyn's view, it is assumed that those later generations, of course, *would* read the normative text into different contexts, for different purposes, and for each distinctive context. Steyn does not ac-

87 Steyn, *Quotations*, 187.

88 Childs, "Canonical Shape," 47.

knowledge this fundamental aspect of reception and therefore misses helpful clarification of the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 that may come by hearing the voice of 1QpHab attentively and in locution with Luke. Fundamentally, Steyn misunderstands the value of the dynamic process of reception that a normative text goes through; part of that process is assessing what each context says about how each reader respectively appropriates the text in question and what the exegesis of a new context reveals about the potential meaning of a text.

As we can see to this point of this chapter, there is a tradition of reading Hab. 1:5, though a rather confined one. As we have done in the previous two chapters, Luke is set in locution with a reader of the same normative text, hoping to gain further insight into how Luke interprets texts against the background of a conversation with a reader from the same milieu. Importantly, we hope to see how he may be making distinctive claims about the meaning of this text according to the exegesis of his unique context.

In the earliest parts of this chapter, we observed that the majority of scholars and commentators—a majority that has existed at least since the interpretation of John Calvin—believe that the quotation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 should be related to the astonishment of the Jews at the lordship of Jesus and his work that Paul explains in his first speech to the Jews and God-fearers in Antioch in Pisidia. In light of the evidence, one might challenge the majority stance, and suggest that the astonishment was rather associated with and directed towards the second Sabbath address by Paul where he proclaims that the salvation work of the messiah and Lord Jesus is also applied to uncircumcised, non-God-fearing, non-synagogue-associated Gentiles. It is at this point that we can begin our interlocution between Luke and 1QpHab.

We begin by highlighting two major areas in which a conversation between interlocutors, Luke and 1QpHab, would aid us in understanding the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 with greater clarity. The first regards our discussion about the majority interpretation of the referent of “work” in the quotation of LXX-Hab. 1:5. The second regards the fresh ecclesiological claims that Luke begins to make by his use of LXX-Hab. 1:5, starting his move further away from where his interlocutors stand on the issue for non-Jewish peoples to be part of the people of God. The second area begins to demonstrate a distinguished Lukan reading that one can begin to qualify as distinctively “Christian” rather than Jewish in tendency according to the conversation among interlocutors. (I observe below the likely significance of Antioch in Pisidia being the first place where people were first called “Christian”; namely, Antioch in Acts 11:26.) Notably, this second instance is an important moment where Luke’s exegesis of his context (i.e., the “last days” or “day of the Lord” that is marked by Jesus’ universal lordship) through a normative text drives him to the point of claiming

a specific ecclesiological truth that is in major disagreement with his tradition and its interpretation of the normative text. This will be addressed below.

First, by setting Luke and 1QpHab in locution, the first area of concern we will address is the referent of "work" and the question of what is particularly "astonishing" to Luke and 1QpHab when they are reading Hab. 1:5. According to both readers, the work of God is particularly tied to the use of a non-Jewish, Gentile, nation against his own people. We have argued above, against a majority, that the work of God that Luke uniquely emphasizes is not the work through Jesus on the cross and resurrection (or the proclamation thereof), but instead that Gentiles without any synagogue commitment or allegiance could receive salvation by Jesus, and that this was God's plan all along.

In joy, Acts 13:48 says, the Gentile audience invades the people of God when offered salvation apart from the Law of Moses. Their reception of Jesus as their savior and Lord as those unaffiliated to the synagogue is the subject of astonishment, and the work that God does by incorporating the unaffiliated Gentiles under Jesus' lordship causes a division of the Jewish people when Paul declares that God's plan is now to turn with the message of Jesus' lordship to the Gentiles.

In conversation with 1QpHab, Luke finds agreement with such a referent to "work." As observed, Steyn has said that there is little to compare with Luke if the reading of 1QpHab were set in interaction with the Lukan reading. However, there is a striking similarity concerning how God operates in both 1QpHab and the Lukan context, though each is discretely addressing different concerns. For 1QpHab, God will bring punishment upon those who are unfaithful to God's covenant by the powerful nation of the time, the Kittim. This is his "work." Of course, it would appear most natural to see that the Lukan and 1QpHab reading disagree overall concerning the goal of the non-Jewish nation used by God; Luke shows that the Gentile "invasion" is one of incorporation into the people of God in Acts, and the Kittim is simply a tool in God's punishment against the "traitors" to God's will. In spite of what it looks like overall, both readers in dialogue find agreement that the Jewish people are divided into faithful and unfaithful by the invasion of a Gentile entity at the hands of God; for Luke, some Jews and God-fearers reject and some presumably accept that Gentiles can be part of the people of God under Jesus' lordship without association to the synagogue or circumcision, and likewise some follow the Teacher of Righteousness and some the Man of Lies according to 1QpHab.

Therefore, in light of the comments made by Steyn and the stance of the majority of scholars commenting on the place of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13, we now see that the place of Luke among his tradition has not been seriously considered. This highlights the importance of observing this "conversation"

for our first item of concern. First, rather than those who would hold to a majority opinion that the “astonishing work” of God is that the content of the gospel proclaimed by Paul, in clear continuity *with an observable tradition*, we maintain that the referent to “work” is one clearly associated with the use of a non-Jewish nation by God in his redemptive-historical plan that has ecclesiological implications. According to our three interlocutors, the use of this non-Jewish entity is clearly surprising and unexplainable *if it were not for the Lord saying it is his work* (but even then astonishment seems abounding). Luke has not in this place stood apart from his tradition in order to make the referent of “work” something other than a people group. For Luke, it is still about the Gentiles. The majority of commentators and scholars would have seen Luke distance himself from his reading tradition at this point if he made the text of LXX-Hab. 1:5 refer to a single person who is God’s messiah and Lord *and not* to a non-Jewish group of people. Rather, Luke remains in continuity with the rest of the conversation in his tradition that says *the* astonishing “work” of the Lord is the use of a non-Jewish people to divide and judge the Jewish people for their faithlessness. The conversation of these readers stands in the way of Steyn’s observation that there is nothing to learn from setting Luke vis-a-vis 1QpHab. In fact, there is much to gain, most notably the overturning of a majority interpretation of the use of the LXX-TP in Acts that has seemingly ignored the voice of Luke’s reading milieu and have missed what is astonishing.

The second departure that the Lukan use of LXX-Hab. 1:5 makes, in light of what the interaction between interlocutors makes clear, is probably the most important thing that any of our conversations in this study has yet to uncover. It is the practical outcome of a Lord who is universal in his power and offer of salvation. While in the first “departure” Luke is continuous with his interlocutor regarding the use of the Gentiles by the Lord, this second place of departure is clearly a movement away from his milieu and tradition which begins to demonstrate a more distinctive “Christian” nature of the Lukan reading of texts rather than a purely Jewish one.

Early in our work, we critiqued Watson’s hermeneutic in his book on Paul.⁸⁹ Primarily, this study adopted Watson’s method with the belief that it would be the best way to clarify the Lukan intertextual method. However, in agreement with Hays, one might raise concern that Watson too quickly flattened the interpretation of Paul and his milieu seeking agreement without seriously emphasizing those places where Paul was making distinctive truth claims about Jesus and Christianity.

89 Watson, *Paul*.

Here in Acts 13, Luke is making a distinctive truth claim by his use of LXX-Hab. 1:5. Importantly, this claim is something other than what his interlocutors (i.e. his reading tradition) are saying. It is not that it is technically contrary to what they are saying; it is simply different, but more importantly, it is a bold claim.

In sum, his claim is that the "warring nation" is a joyous Gentile audience that receives Jesus as their Lord and is incorporated into his people while being uncircumcised and unaffiliated with the synagogue. The Gentiles in Acts 13 are not warring like the Kittim of Luke's interlocutor, 1QpHab, would be, dividing the covenant followers from the covenant breakers, the followers of the Teacher from those who follow the Man of Lies as the normative text says in a similar way. The astonishment for Luke is much more uniquely Christian and demonstrates the extent of the lordship of Jesus over a new people by their inclusion. This is a Lukan ecclesiological claim that is distinctive to his reading of this text.

Early in this chapter, we observed that the geographical situation of Antioch, where Luke now uses LXX-Hab. 1:5, was where the followers of Jesus were first called "Christians." In his conversation with his reading milieu, Luke establishes an extra-Jewish theology of the nations vis-a-vis association with the people of God. It is a Christian ecclesiology that is inclusive of all nations despite a lack of circumcision or synagogue membership. The only association required here in Acts 13 is that one names Jesus as Lord. The Lukan Paul forecasts this in his first speech just prior to his use of LXX-Hab. 1:5, saying in Acts 13:38–39,

Let it be known to you therefore, brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you, and by him everyone who believes is freed from everything from which you could not be freed by the Law of Moses.

Those Gentiles who receive salvation without these qualifications are the "weapon" which God uses to part the Jews between those who are aligned with his Lord and messiah and those who are not. Paul makes this clear by saying they will now "turn to the Gentiles" with the message of salvation since the Jews who protest "judge [themselves] unworthy of eternal life" (Acts 13:46–47). In light of his reading tradition, Luke makes his claim here more explicit by saying that the meaning introduced here and the significance of LXX-Hab. 1:5 is seen by how Paul declares Isaiah 49:6 fulfilled by the reception of the gospel by the Gentiles (in spite of the Jewish ire).

Vis-a-vis his interlocutors, for Luke there is no violent threat of war for those who scoff at God's plan but rather plans to incorporate the nations in

a way that has never been seen among the Jewish people. The Lukan claim of inclusion is a matter of ecclesiology; either inclusion by recognizing Jesus as Lord over all or exclusion by disbelief in God's work in such inclusion. In other words, for one to confess Jesus as Lord, Luke contends that they must recognize that he is Lord over all nations and can offer all nations salvation as they are (i.e. Gentiles *qua* Gentiles).

In a geographical locale where people are already labeled "Christian," Luke takes a stance that is a serious disjuncture from his tradition by his way of reading LXX-Hab. 1:5 that serves to develop his narrative into a new stage of redemptive-history and begins to define more clearly the boundaries and definition of the people of God under the lordship of Jesus. This disjuncture is clearly a new development from Luke's broader tradition. Reaching as far back to the Law of Moses (Ex. 12:48), those who would be part of Israel fully would be able to take part in Passover which required circumcision of the *gēr*.

Though not at the heart of our central thesis, the full reception of the Gentiles under the universal lordship of Jesus, according to Luke, may point to a fuller understanding of Jesus' identity and unique work on the cross. For Luke, Jesus might just be Lord, messiah *and* Passover. He is the one who provides even the Gentiles access to the salvation he offers, even *sans* circumcision, according to the Lukan Paul's words in 13:38–39. Even more explicitly, the identity of these uncircumcised men as now fully part of God's people is clear and had been planned.

The role of God's use of the nations in Acts 13 is a further development of the threat of exile that was strongly suggested in his use of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7. Though his interlocutor 1QpHab would have it, the Kittim would come warring in to punish the unfaithful dividing them from the faithful. Luke would rather suggest, as Jervell famously said, that the division of the people of God is revealed over whom they believe Jesus to be, and more to the point in Acts 13, who his people are and what qualifies them. In view of redemptive-history, this is a major ecclesiological pronouncement and shift made by the Lukan Paul. Essentially, he informs the jealous ones that their refusal to accept that Gentiles *qua* Gentiles are welcomed into the people of God as God's divine "work" reveals that they stand outside the promise of God's Messiah. Their punishment is exclusion (cf. Acts 13:41; "vanish," ἀφ' ὧν ἔξω). When they vanish, they are exiled, and it is a consequence incurred completely on the basis of their own decisions as Acts 13:46b makes clear.

The conversation between interlocutors makes clear that with respect to how the nations are associated with God's "work," Luke could not more clearly depart from his tradition and establish a new theology on the nations and the salvation of the nations. Beginning with LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13:41, a watershed

moment of Christian theology breaks through. There is no debate about who Jesus is and the salvation he offers to a mixed Jewish and god-fearing audience in Pisidian Antioch, but the explicit contention over who is included in this salvation (see how 13:42–43 contrast 13:45–46) provides evidence that this is the first “Christian” moment of reading texts for Luke and that there is explicit contention over who is included in this salvation.

Some might suggest that our previous chapter describes a moment where Luke made “Christian” claims against the Temple. That would be the stance of many we treated, including Kilgallen. But one will remember the importance of the conversation in that chapter was that Luke’s interlocutor CD-A read the text of Amos 5 concerning the Temple in Jerusalem in very similar ways to Luke. The emphasis was on a pattern of idolatry and not the temple in itself that drew Israel away from their Lord and Righteous One. Therefore, Luke is hardly making such a departure that would make his reading in that case a wholly different system of thought. Instead, it was an important point of agreement in the conversation that led us to important conclusions regarding the temple in Lukan thought. The point to observe here is that when the reading of the LXX-TP (namely, LXX-Joel 3:1–5, LXX-Amos 5:25–27, and LXX-Hab 1:5) are taken together, what becomes a uniquely “Christian” thought is that Jesus is universal Lord and his salvation is revealed as available to all outside both the temple *and the synagogue system*. Combined, our three LXX-TP quotations in Acts 2, 7 and 13 make this reality clear, and combined they clarify and fulfill the universal nature of the day of the Lord from our first LXX-TP quotation in Acts 2. Luke continues to read and construe the LXX-TP in a distinctive way with a specific role as markers of important turning-points in his context and in order to clearly to exegete this context with the LXX-TP to give a better understanding of who Jesus is and what his “work” is in the “last days.”

In summary, the Lukan reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 introduced new implications of the lordship of Jesus and of the repentance required by that realization of his lordship which was to reach “those who are far off,” a plausible pointer towards the importance of Gentiles in the scope of the lordship of Jesus. Clearly departing from the majority of Lukan scholars, the proper understanding of the “work” of God, vis-a-vis the conversation between Luke and his interlocutor, is that the Gentiles’ move toward invasion and parting of God’s people is God’s work. However, in one of the most striking claims about a new way of seeing the nations, Luke parts ways with his normative text, LXX-Hab. 1:5, and his interlocutor, 1QpHab, concerning the nature of the Gentile invasion and how the people of God would be divided. The Gentiles are incorporated, *qua* Gentiles, against any prior pattern in Luke’s reading tradition. Within this chapter, it is said that this moment fulfills Isaiah 49:6, but within the grand

narrative, it potentially fulfills Acts 1:8 in its geography and Acts 2:39, ecclesio-logically. Luke, by his intertextuality, is claiming a truth that is a distinctive one among his reading tradition and will present a challenge to the early, majority Jewish-Christian church. The next use of the LXX-TP, LXX-Amos 9:11–12, is the key text to address this anticipated question concerning the membership of uncircumcised Gentiles into the nascent church, since their only model to date is that of partial membership for outsiders—namely, “God-fearer” or “proselyte.”

“All the Gentiles Who Are Called”: Sending the Gentile Mission and the Lukan Reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15

The Text of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 and of Amos 15:16–18

LXX 9:11–12

¹¹ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, ¹² ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.

Acts 15:16–18

¹⁶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω

καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν

καὶ [] τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς **ἀνοικοδομήσω**

καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν [],¹

¹⁷ ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον

καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς,

λέγει κύριος [] ποιῶν ταῦτα ¹⁸ γνωστὰ ἅπ’ αἰῶνος.

I Introduction

The final LXX-Book-of-the-Twelve quotation in Acts is Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–17.² This is the last explicit and redemptive-history oriented Lukan

- 1 There are significant alterations to the *Vorlage* in 15:16. Like the previous chapters, the changes are marked in the text provided above. Please reference chapter 4 section III.b.2 for an explanation of what seems to be the motivation for the changes. Some transposition appears to be happening, but it is not likely that it is simply transposition. Rather, there appears to be intentional editing of the source text to fit it to the context and slim it down to its essential parts.
- 2 There is a broader historical question about how Paul's reports in Galatians 2 and its presumed parallel with Acts 15 work out. Obviously, it has been debated at length if these accounts are

use of the Old Testament in Acts until Acts 28:26–27. There Paul quotes Isaiah 6:9–10 to close Acts, a quotation which was briefly discussed in the previous chapter.³

The setting of the quotation is the Jerusalem Council⁴ in a speech where James gives his judgment upon the necessity of Gentiles being circumcised in order fully to be considered Christians.⁵ The question of this chapter is what role does the LXX-Amos 9:11–12 play in James' speech at the Council? And more specifically, what is Luke attempting to clarify by his appropriation of this normative text? Or, how does Luke read this text in his distinctive context?

1.a *The Question Governing the Jerusalem Council and LXX-Amos 9:11–12*

There is a basic agreement regarding the purpose of the conference described in this passage in which the quotation of Amos is situated. Conzelmann represents this view well when he says, "Here the problem is set forth. It does not

referring to the same event, or if Galatians 2 better lines up with other Pauline Jerusalem visits documented in Acts (possibly Acts 11). Some go as far as to say that the Apostolic Council is a Lukan creation (cf. Haenchen, *Acts*; for similar remarks, cf., Lake and Cadbury, *Notes*, 212; see further discussion in C. K. Barrett, *Acts: 15–28* [New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004], 709–12). Some also propose *de facto* Pauline historical priority when in conflict with the Lukan account (Lake and Cadbury, *Notes*, 198–99). This debate is beyond the scope of this study and will not be further investigated here. However, more recent studies rightly pushed back by means of their own historical studies on the accuracy of those that are more skeptical of Luke's historical reliability (cf. esp. Hengel, *History*, 111–26; and Bauckham, "James").

- 3 Of course, as noted in the introduction, the Lukan Paul rather perfunctorily quotes the law (Ex. 22:28) in his defense speech before the Council in 23:6. This quotation, however, clearly stands in contrast with the typical quotations by Luke that hold a redemptive-historical value, and should not be accounted for in the same way.
- 4 There has been some debate as to how appropriate it is to call the meeting of the leaders of the early church in Jerusalem a "Council." Fitzmyer notes this debate and says that calling it a Council is actually a "misnomer" in light of church history. However, he decides to retain the term "Council" (but always in quotation marks) since, as he says, "when one reflects on the issue that is discussed and its doctrinal significance for the future of the church, one can see why it might be regarded as a sort of 'Council'" (*Acts*, 543). Others have been a little more creative with their title for the meeting, cf. Jostein Ådna, "James' Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and the Elders in Jerusalem [Acts 15]," in *Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*, ed. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000], 125–61. We will refer to the Jerusalem Council, or the Council, without caveat, since this meeting throughout the church's tradition (and traditionally in NT scholarship) has normally been recognized by this title.
- 5 The place of James in the Lukan narrative, his authority in Jerusalem, and his role as judge in deciding the outcome of the Council in Acts 15 has been a topic of no little debate. For more on the role, possible identity, and authority, cf. e.g., Jervell, *Luke*, 188–93; Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 155 n3 (Bauckham, however, challenges Jervell's assessment that James held more authority than Paul).

have to do with the admission of the Gentiles as such, but with the conditions for their entrance."⁶ Jervell develops Conzelmann's thought further, saying,

The problem with which Luke struggles [and, it could be said, the Council] is to what extent this ecclesiastical practice [of leaving Gentiles uncircumcised] is a breach of the law of Moses with the result that the church as the restored Israel cannot lay claim to the promises and salvation.⁷

Jervell importantly observes that what is discussed at the Jerusalem Council is not purely an ecclesiological issue, but an ecclesiological issue that is related integrally to a soteriological one. Since the Lukan Paul's introduction of the ultimate freedom offered through belief in Jesus from the obligation to full obedience to the Law of Moses (in Acts 13, and even before in 11:3), and the conflict involving Peter and the "circumcision party," there has been an unresolved tension between the Law of Moses and salvation offered in the Lord and Messiah, Jesus, and what this means for the place of the Gentiles in the church.

In Luke's narrative, there is only one chapter between the beginning of Paul's and Barnabas' mission to the Gentiles in Acts 13 and the Council.⁸ However, it is likely, historically speaking, that many decades have passed,⁹ which means that van de Sandt is probably right to say, "The Pauline mission [to the Gentiles] was nevertheless for years welcomed by the Jewish Christians in Judea."¹⁰ So Paul's mission and, by explicit association, the admission of the Gentiles, has been accepted for a long time, but now, decades later, the paired issue of its ecclesiological practice and its soteriological implications are questioned.¹¹ The chronology of the Pauline mission is clearly outside the purview of this present study and, therefore, will not gain any further attention now, though if the pace of the Lukan narrative is illustrative of what his particular emphases are, he is not aiming to describe the detailed travels of Paul. He focuses more plausibly on the movement of the redemptive-historical story as it follows Acts 1:8 and 2:39, from Jerusalem to "those who are far off."

6 Conzelmann, *Acts*, 115.

7 Jervell, *Luke*, 189. Cf. van de Sandt, "An Explanation," 73.

8 van de Sandt, "An Explanation," 96–97.

9 Cf. Jacob Jervell, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 31; Haenchen, *Acts*, 462. Much more, no doubt could be said of the historicity of the lapse between Acts 13 and Acts 15, but the central focus of this study will not allow more attention to this. For an in-depth study on historical aspects between Acts 13 and 15, with a focus on the Lukan Paul, see Hengel and Schwemer, *Paul*, 178–310.

10 Jervell, *Paul*, 32. Cf. also, Jervell, *Luke*, 202 n23.

11 Cf. Jervell, *Paul*, 31.

The place of the Council for the Lukan narrative is (1) not to let the tension linger too long for his readers for the sake of his argument in favor of an ethnically universal church, and (2) to state clearly what the events before the Council in Acts 15 meant for the unfolding of God's redemptive-historical plan in the early church. So the testimony given by Peter, Paul, and Barnabas in Acts 15 is a narrative summary of the events of Acts 10–14 and their importance, namely, the conversion of the first household of Gentiles by Peter in Acts 10 and the first corporate declaration of the Gentile mission as the work of God in Acts 13.

Again, the goal of the Lukan narrative is to provide a particular case for Jesus and his universal reign and offer of salvation, which means for Luke that the focus of Acts must be upon events that create such certainty, and he feels no need to report details that do not work towards this goal. Therefore, as Luke has set it up in his narrative, the Council is one event of great importance to Luke's case. It is generally agreed that the Council was called to resolve the issue of Gentiles entering the people of God as Gentiles and that the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 plays a central role in the Council's deliberation and specifically in James' decision.¹²

12 There was once a time when one could agree with Earl Richard that little has been written on the function of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15. However, that has changed. The mystery of this citation textually and theologically has, in recent years, caused publications to proliferate on the topic, including Richard's own studies and others including, Richard, "The Divine Purpose"; Richard, "Creative Use." Cf. e.g., Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles"; J. Paul Tanner, "James's Quotation of Amos 9 to Settle the Jerusalem Council Debate in Acts 15," *JETS* 55, no. 1 (2012): 65–85; Ådna, "Summit Meeting"; van de Sandt, "An Explanation"; van de Sandt, "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts"; Jostein Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift Als Zeuge der Heidenmission: Die Rezeption von Amos 9:11–12 in Apg 15:16–18," in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 1–23. Jacob L. Helberg, "Wat Sê die Boek Amos en Handeling 15:15–17 Oor die 'n Beloofde Land," *In die Skriflig* 33, no. 4 [1999]: 567–83; Wolfgang Kraus, "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case," in *Translation is Required*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert [Atlanta: SBL, 2010], 171–90; Martin Stowasser, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11 f. in der Qumranüberlieferung und in der Apostelgeschichte: Text- und Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu 4Q174 [Florilegium] III 12/CD VII 16/Apg 7,42b–43; 15,16–18," *ZNW* 92, no. 1–2 [2001]: 47–63; White, "Revisiting." For some, it should be noted, there is the view that Luke used an "erroneously translated" LXX-Amos 9:11–12 text, as per Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 351. For a counterargument to Wolff, see Jones, *Formation*, 176–83). The view of Wolff, et al. is one that now has had much doubt cast upon it by many of the recent studies on this quotation, and for the purposes of this study, will not be a view that garners further discussion (for more on this, cf. e.g., Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 161; W. Edward Glenny, "The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Acts 15," *BBR* 22 [2012]: 9).

1.b *The Question of This Chapter: Can't There Just Be a Christian Version of "God-Fearers"?*

Conzelmann has said concerning the issue that Acts 15 tackles,

[The judgment that Gentiles were not required to keep ceremonial laws] happened (despite Acts 15:10¹³) not from a tactical consideration (in order to make it easier to become a Christian). It would have been possible to have adopted the Jewish model and to have created a wider circle of "God-fearers" around an inner circle of full Christians.¹⁴

Conzelmann is right. Luke could have made his argument more acceptable and his pathway easier by merely allowing the Gentiles to be partial members of the people of God.¹⁵ But this is not what happens, and it does not happen because of the appeal to LXX-Amos 9:11–12 (and it would frankly contradict the flow of the narrative since the quotation of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13 discussed in the previous chapter). Therefore, what is it about this text that gives James and the Council certainty that the Gentiles are to be incorporated into the people of God, *qua* Gentiles? Also, what is it about the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 that gives sufficient reason for certainty that Jesus is universal Lord over all people, which includes the issue of Gentile inclusion *qua* Gentiles, and subsequently brings an end to his need to cite Scripture directly in the rest of Acts (especially in a narrative that has to this point been marked by the saturation of Scripture)?

Such questions bring us to a degree of inquiry into Acts that is universal than merely local. These quotations lead us to ask what the programmatic role of the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 is for what Luke has said and will say in Acts, and not only for Acts 15. Or finally, how does LXX-Amos 9:11–12 serve as the final text of the curious and distinctive Lukan construal of the LXX-TP in Acts, a construed use of the LXX-TP that is set apart in a clearly any other use of the same corpus in the NT?

However, as in the previous three chapters, we must first become readers of the normative text, LXX-Amos 9:11–12, before we assess the Lukan appropriation. Therefore, the next section will focus on the LXX-Amos 9:11–12

13 Conzelmann's reading of 15:10, however, is contrary to the discussion on "the Law of Moses" in the previous chapter (see section III.c.3).

14 Hans Conzelmann, *Gentiles/Jews/Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 252 n103.

15 This is to be distinguished from Jervell's (cf. *Luke*, 51–54) understanding of the Gentiles as "associate people," since Jervell does not seem to be implying that this would indicate a second-class or lower status, simply a distinct one.

and its immediate context. We will then explore the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15, followed by a brief study of the reading of Amos 9:11a in 4QFlor, another reader of the same text from the Lukan milieu. This chapter will conclude with a virtual discussion between interlocutors, Luke, and 4QFlor, concerning their own appropriation of Amos 9:11, and what this specifically tells us about the Lukan usage.

II LXX-Amos 9:11–12: a Rebuilt Davidic Reign in the Eschatological Future

A new pericope is begun in the prophecy at Amos 9:11–12. Israel is promised an era in the future (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, 9:11) when God would intervene in the history of the world and bless the nation of Israel after a time of his judgment (cf. Amos 8:3, 9, 11, 13).¹⁶

The eschatological prophecy in 9:11–12 naturally hinges on ὅπως (plus ἄν), “so that,” which gives clarity to the reason the tent of David is reconstructed, namely, so that it may be sought by a restored people of God. So the prophecy is read generally as “in that day” the Lord will act “so that” what is promised to you, Israel, will be fulfilled.

The Lord’s actions that precipitate his declared promise are described in 9:11, which concerns the “booth” or “tent” of David that is “fallen.”¹⁷ It can be assumed from the description that the “tent of David” is still in a state of disrepair at the time of the prophecy and, presumably, even at the time of the translation of Greek Amos. However, in 9:11 the Lord promises to “raise” and “rebuild” the tent from its fallen state (ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυιδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω).

II.a *The Tent of David and What It Is Meant to Represent*

Central to the fulfillment of the promise laid out in 9:12 is the rebuilding of the tent of David. But the referent of this tent is debated.¹⁸

16 Wolff (*Joel and Amos*, 352) quotes Wellhausen, who properly articulates the shift that is made when the reader of Amos reaches 9:11. Wellhausen says we read here “roses and lavender instead of blood and iron.” He may be closest to the truth with regard to the feelings of the student of Amos.

17 The “fallen-ness” of the tent is given extra emphasis by the repetition of πίπτω (πεπτωκυῖαν καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα). This may indicate the necessity of the Lord’s intervention for restoration to happen (cf. LXX-Amos 9:12; λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα).

18 Andersen and Freedman (*Amos*, 914) say that the true referent may never be recovered due to the uniqueness of the expression in the Hebrew Bible, though its general sense can probably be understood.

Van der Kooij takes it to be the literal city of David, Jerusalem, which for him includes the temple.¹⁹ However, his referent may be too specific to fit the context of Amos. Specifically, Glenny takes issue with the exclusivity of Jerusalem as the referent for the "tent of David" when, for him, the prophecy is so clearly universal.²⁰ Instead, Glenny believes "the tent" in Acts 9:12 to be a "metaphorical" allusion to the eschatological Davidic messianic reign in light of the connection *σκηνη Δαυιδ* has with the prediction in Isaiah 16:5 of the future establishment of a king *ἐν σκηνῇ Δαυιδ*.²¹ Nevertheless, such universality should not remove a level of focus upon Jerusalem, since Jerusalem remains a central place of redemption-history, even for the early church, Jewish and Gentile Christian alike, as has been said by Hengel²² and Jervell.²³ Paul even sets apart the leaders of the church who reside in Jerusalem from other early church leaders by calling them "pillars" (Gal. 2:9, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι). Furthermore, Glenny's messianic metaphor seems imported into the prophecy in light of his interpretation of the Davidic theme. It may be that such a reading that promotes a Davidic messianic meaning is taking into consideration later readings of the Amos text, or tent imagery, and bringing that meaning back to the prophecy. (A similar discussion regarding the nature of "the tent" will occur in section III.b.2 with reference to the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12.)

Standing closer to the natural reading of the text is Jeremias who believes that the restored tent refers to an ideal time of Israel as a people restored by the Lord to a state similar to that in the period of the Davidic dynasty, "before the sin of God's kings thwarted God's plans."²⁴ For Amos, "the tent of David" is promised in an eschatological, utopian era that echoes the past, as we have seen in earlier prophecies and appropriations in later texts in this present work. But for Amos, this utopian era is marked by new progress, abundance, and renewal (cf. 9:13–15). A key point to observe is that Amos talks about a remnant of Israel (cf. 9:8), but he also speaks of "the remnants of man and all of the nations" (οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) in 9:12. The entirety

19 Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book," in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence*, ed. Christopher Tuckett (Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), 53–64. For a similar view, see Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 353.

20 Glenny, *Amos*, 158–59; Glenny, *Meaning*, 222.

21 But due to the fact that the translators of LXX-Isaiah and LXX-Twelve Prophets cannot be proven to be the same person or persons, this verbal connection made by Glenny is an insecure one and is possibly coincidental. See his discussion in *Meaning*, 221–23.

22 Cf. e.g., Hengel, *Jesus and Paul*, 59, 101; Hengel, *History*, 66, 95.

23 Cf. e.g., Jervell, *Luke*, 53, 185. Overall, Jerusalem holds a significant place in Jervell's thinking according to his hermeneutic for reading Acts. This can be seen throughout both "The Divided People of God" (*Luke*, 41–74), and "James: The Defender of Paul" (*Luke*, 185–207).

24 Jörg Jeremias, *The Book of Amos: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 166–67. Cf. Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 917.

of the tent is not fallen but only portions. Amos 9:8 shows this when it describes the remnant of Jacob. But the prophecy includes the possibility of a “fallen-ness” that stretches beyond Israel to all humanity. The potential reach of such a “fallen-ness” would correspond uniquely to the universal reach and purpose of the rebuilt tent, since “the remnants of man” is added to by the prophet by “all the nations” (καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) in 9:12. The universality of the tent’s reach is unmistakable. LXX-Amos 9:12 is a unique prophecy by its association of non-Israelite-nations with a remnant set aside by God. The remnant gives hope of a glorious day when the Lord will return to rebuild the tent of David and reign. This is a day that is plausibly constructed by utopian hopes for the future that set a pattern to be fulfilled where the people who the Lord calls by his name include even the nations.

There are potential difficulties in reading the tent in LXX-Amos 9:11 as a literal city or landmark of national pride (i.e., Jerusalem and the Temple). Instead, it appears better to read “the tent” with more significant eschatological themes in mind that point to a plan that the Lord has for a universal audience. It speaks of the hope of renewal that will come in the eschatological reign under the Lord in the day of the Lord, which will include some of the nation of Israel *but also* some of the nations surrounding Israel. A blueprint is that of Israel’s past, noted by the remnants of what once was,²⁵ and the day of the Lord will be marked for Amos by a new reign and a new people. The Lord himself will reign and the people who are called by his name will include Israelites and non-Israelites alike.

11.b *The Nations Seek the Rebuilt Tent of David*

In LXX-Amos 9:12, the purpose of the rebuilding phase and the fulfillment of the promise of Lord is revealed. The rebuilding is so that (ὅπως ᾗ) “the remnant of the humans and all nations” would seek the Lord as the Lord himself calls them.²⁶ The Lord promises Israel in 9:12 that they will not be his only possession, but that the nations will live peaceably alongside them in a future era as his possession as well. It is said in 9:12 that “[the Lord’s] name will be called upon [the nations]” (ἐφ’ οὗς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς). This theo-

25 Glenny (*Meaning*, 218; *Amos*, 158) notes that αἰών in 9:11 (καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος) can either refer to the future (Gen. 3:22; 6:3; Ex. 14:13; Is. 13:20; 25:2; 48:12) or the past (Gen. 6:4; Deut. 32:7), but similar phrases found elsewhere in LXX books (Mic. 7:14; Mal. 3:4, cf. Sir. 50:23; Is. 63:9) would suggest that Amos requires αἰών to mean the past, in this context.

26 Most translations of the LXX (cf. *NETS* and Glenny, *Amos*, 39) supply the object of ἐκζητέω (“me”) that is not present in the LXX. As Glenny (*Amos*, 159) notes, the earlier context of LXX-Amos 5:4,6 that discusses the “seeking of the Lord, and the immediate context of 9:12 would suggest ‘me’ is the proper object of the verb ‘to seek.’”

logically important phase, as in LXX-Joel 3:5, indicates the care of the Lord in salvation for those who call upon his name.²⁷ In many ways, the Lord's actions of "calling his name upon" those of the nations that seek him is analogous to adoption by legally making his people those who were not his people. Such a saying indicates a relationship to the Lord that is unique (Jer. 14:9; 15:15–16) and one's commitment to a loyal relationship to the Lord (Deut. 28:10).²⁸

LXX-Amos 9:12 ends saying, "... the Lord, who is the one doing (ὁ ποιῶν) these things." The significance of the emphasis upon God's action is that he is the only one that one can place their hope in the rebuilding of the fallen tent since he is the only one who can fulfill the promise made to David. Furthermore, that the nations would be part of the people of God is difficult to imagine if it were a promise authenticated and fulfilled by the Lord himself. It is clear from these words that it is solely the Lord's doing that makes this future era of restoration have universal importance for future reality (cf. λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα).

The Greek version of Amos, the text that Luke reads, is one of extreme ecclesiological progress that harks back to the blueprint of an old dynasty. The prophecy sees the Lord come to reign over the whole earth, and the nations outside of Israel seek his lordship with abandon. The Lord calls by his own name these nations, many of whom presumably have warred against his people viciously in the past, but are now changed because they seek the Lord (cf. ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, 9:12). LXX-Amos 9:11–12 is a remarkable end to a prophecy that is more of a prophecy of doom and gloom, though it should be remembered that much of this doom and gloom was directed at God's people, Israel, and their idolatry. The nations are being called to salvation here in LXX-Amos 9:11–12, not unfairly, but to the same extent to which Israel should hope to be rebuilt in light of the greater prophecy of Amos.

III LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15: Gentile as Gentile

In light of the message of the prophet, we move to the text of Acts and how his historical context is exegeted by this text. The prophecy in Amos 9:11–12 plays the starring role in giving an explanation to a people who are called by God under the reign of the Lord *as they are*—uncircumcised.

27 Cf. Glenny, *Meaning*, 227; Dines, "Amos," 303.

28 Glenny, *Amos*, 160.

Earlier, we established that it is generally accepted that the Jerusalem Council convenes to discuss the issue of the Gentiles and their entrance into the church and access to salvation without circumcision. It has also been established that the Lukan James' appeal to LXX-Amos 9:11–12 takes a central place in the final judgment of the Council. What we seek to explore further is the role of the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in the context of the Jerusalem Council and Acts 15, and what it has to say about the Lord's work, the tent of David and its nature, and the relationship between Jewish and Gentile Christians.

Hermeneutically, this section will seek to answer the questions posed at the beginning of the chapter concerning the programmatic role LXX-Amos 9:11–12 appears to have to see that the quotation of redemptive-historical-minded Scripture with a redemptive-history theme ceases in Acts at this point until Acts 28:26–27. But further, the appropriation of LXX-Amos 9 must be set into the context of the Lukan narrative of Acts. Seeing the quotation in this context contrasts a major stream of scholarship that seeks to set it in another context, namely, the "original context" of detected scriptural allusions supposedly made by Luke in his use of LXX-Amos 9:11–12. This view, however, undermines the Lukan volition as an active reader who holds the freedom of exploring the meaning spectrum of a normative text, and who is engaged in the construal of a certain corpus in order that his context is accurately exegeted.

The central imagery for the Lukan James is the tent of David, which comes directly from the normative text, LXX-Amos 9:11–12. James claims in 15:14–15 that this imagery, by the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, gives clarity to the question of why the Gentiles are legitimized as full members of the people of God. He says the eschatological Amos prophecy agrees with (and explains) the testimony of Peter in 15:7–11, and this will lead to a broader consensus among the apostles and the Holy Spirit later (15:28).²⁹ In James' judgment, there is a strong relationship between God taking the Gentiles as "a people for

29 Not too much should be made of what corpus the Lukan James is referring to specifically with τῶν προφητῶν, since it is clear that at a general level his quotation is from LXX-Amos 9:11–12. It is plausible that he is specifically referring to the Book-of-the-Twelve Prophets (cf. also, David Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 430), since this is how he introduces quotations from this corpus in the other three occasions in Acts (D does not include Ἰωήλ in Acts 2:16, which if accepted would make our stance more secure). Some (cf. Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles"; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 503) have felt it refers to scriptural prophecy more broadly, which is also possible. In fact, it is commonly held that James alludes to Is. 45:12 at the end of his quotation of Amos 9:12, though it is our belief that he is actually speaking of the message of Scripture more broadly. A third view is that the Lukan James uses a formulaic plural to introduce Amos (cf. Barrett, *Acts*: 15–28, 725; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 555).

his name” (15:14, 17), and two further themes associated with the tent of David: God’s return and God’s rebuilding of the tent.

Before getting into the passage further, there is an important relationship that Luke makes here that gives greater identity to the Lord Jesus. The quotation is said to be the evidence of God’s call upon “a people for his name” (15:14; ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ) and that the actions taken in the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 are expressly “the Lord’s” (i.e., κύριος). The quotation is the exact word and action taken by the Lord (15:17; λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα) in fulfillment of God’s eschatological plan to take a people for his name. Such an association between “God” and “the Lord” makes a critical proto-trinitarian statement about Jesus’ lordship *and* divinity, a statement that is unique to Luke’s context.

III.a *The Eschatological Restoration of the Tent of David*

The Lukan James immediately contemporizes the quotation by reading the phrase in LXX-Amos 9:11, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, as μετὰ ταῦτα.³⁰ For James, it is after the events already described by Peter, Paul, and Barnabas and affirmed by the Holy Spirit that indicate divine intervention that is occurring now by his “return.”

For Luke in Acts 15:16, the Lord’s divine intervention is inaugurated by his return (μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω).³¹ In order to demonstrate God’s initiative to return and intervene into history for the sake of saving his people, Luke both changes the LXX-Amos 9:11 text from a future-focused prophecy to a presently-fulfilled prophecy, as noted already, and replaces ἀναστήσω in LXX-Amos 9:11 with ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω, in Acts 15:16a.³² The focus for Luke is God’s restorative return to rebuild the tent of David for his eschatological people.³³

III.a.1 Verbs of Returning and Rebuilding and Where They Come From
Bauckham and others have suggested that the Lukan change is due to the influence of other texts beside LXX-Amos 9:11. The primary reason Bauckham et al. have appealed to other source texts outside of the one quoted by Luke (i.e., LXX-Amos 9:11) is because, while the transitive ἀνοικοδομέω appears

30 Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 503. Cf. Richard, “Creative Use,” 49.

31 Luke edits out of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 both occurrences of ἀνίστημι, this one being the first. Luke seems keen to not confuse this prophecy with the resurrection (against a certain stream of scholarship who views the “raising” of the tent to be the resurrection), which ἀνίστημι is used to describe most often in Acts. This will be discussed further below.

32 Cf. Richard, “Creative Use,” 49.

33 Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 163–64. See also, Glenney, “Apostolic Hermeneutics,” 12.

grammatically to take the place of ἀνίστημι with the “tent of David” as its object, ἀναστρέφω as an intransitive verb seems to have no cause or origin in Amos 9:11.

According to Bauckham et al., Luke’s adjustment of LXX-Amos 9:11a is “extracted from a larger context” from “other biblical prophecies.”³⁴ Bauckham appeals to three texts to make his case. First, for μετὰ ταῦτα he turns to LXX-Hos. 3:5 where the Lord says, “And after these things, the sons of Israel shall return ... (καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ). Second, in order to capture Luke’s theme of the Lord’s action of returning, Bauckham appeals to Zech. 8:3 (τάδε λέγει κύριος Καὶ ἐπιστρέψω ἐπὶ Σιών) and to LXX-Jer. 12:15 (καὶ ἔσται μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέψω).³⁵ But Bauckham prefers LXX-Jer. 12:15 because of its reference to rebuilding and of the nations among his people.

However, Bauckham’s proposed allusions run into problems when he attempts to draw a strict connection with Luke’s appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11. First, in both LXX-Jer. 12:15 and LXX-Zech 8:3, the verb used for the Lord’s turning is ἐπιστρέφω. In Acts 15:16 the verb is ἀναστρέφω. MS D is the only one that uses ἐπιστρέφω for 15:16. Bauckham notes this difference, though does not give any steady answer to the apparent difference in his proposed verbal analogy besides the suggestion that Luke is either not following the Greek Scriptures at this point, or that Luke is attempting to match the prefix-pattern created by other verbs immediately surrounding ἀναστρέφω (i.e., ἀνοικοδομέω and ἀνορθόω).³⁶ Even if appealed to, MS D has been rightly criticized by Pervo for misunderstanding the literary use of ἀναστρέφω by Luke.³⁷

Secondly, and probably more importantly, the biblical allusions cited to make his case are too many and too complicated. Bauckham’s intertextual solution, including ties to Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Hosea for the Lukan change, leads one to ask if this is Luke’s intertextuality or Bauckham’s that is elucidated here. It gets to a point also where one begins to wonder if this is not a confusion of categories methodologically but has become a study of biblical theology instead of a study of a later reader who explicitly indicates an authoritative text that they are appropriating for a new context. That is, it seems that Luke’s intertextual appeal is explicit to one text: LXX-Amos 9:11–12 from the written book of the “prophets” (τῶν προφητῶν καθὼς γέγραπται; see the introduction

34 Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 163.

35 Cf. Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 163–64.

36 Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 164.

37 Pervo, *Acts*, 375 n76. Cf. also, Richard (“Creative Use,” 49) who calls it an aspect of “stylistic tendencies of Luke.” Bauckham’s (“James and the Gentiles,” 164) statement concerning why Luke uses ἀναστρέφω here could possibly be in harmony with Richard and Pervo, but he does not say enough for this to be substantiated (he says, “[ἀναστρέφω may appear] due to a desire to relate this verb to following verbs (ἀνοικοδομέω, ἀνορθόω)”).

for why this plausibly indicates specifically The Book of the Twelve Prophets or Minor Prophets³⁸). There are undoubtedly significant changes to that text, but it is hard to tell if that is because of LXX-Jer 12:5 or LXX-Zech. 8:3 or even LXX-Hos. 3:5 simply because Luke never reveals that information.

III.a.2 A Contextual Solution according to a Lukan Construal and στρέφω-stemmed Words

The problem with the approach laid out above is that the method looks to texts outside of Luke's work or to texts that he is explicitly quoting in Act. Instead, might it be better to look more locally? The clues for these textual changes are likely to be found in the narrative flow of Acts and are probably informed by that context.

The essential problem with Bauckham's method above is that his explanation moves the reader of Acts away from answering the question of Lukan appropriation into a specific context, what requirements this context has on a text that is read by an active and engaged reader, and further how his narrative in Acts may better furnish clues to such an alteration of his text. Specifically, the suggested allusion to LXX-Jer., etc. correctly look for a clearer reason for the Lukan change but privileges the wrong text and context. It's even possible that it misses an essential redemptive-historical motif that Luke has been weaving through Acts for this important turning point in Acts 15.

What we propose is that within the broader Lukan narrative of Acts, there are two significant places where Luke prepares the reader of Acts for the events of the Jerusalem Counsel and James' exegesis that begins at 15:16. What results is the appropriation of Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–18 that highlights God's return and work of the divine rebuilding of the tent of David that fundamentally resolves the exilic state of God's people and the place of the Gentile inclusion in his plan.

The two places that set the context for James' exegesis in Acts 15 are found in (1) Stephen's speech where God directly turns (ἐστρεψεν δὲ ὁ θεός, 7:42) away from Israel after they reject his appointed leader, and (2) where God turns from the Jews to the Gentiles (στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη) in Antioch via Paul and Barnabas. In these three places, each is associated with an LXX-TP text covered in previous chapters,³⁹ and there is a use of a στρέφω-stemmed word that

38 Cf. Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones," 281.

39 The context that previous chapters in Acts, specifically Acts 7, set for the language used by the Lukan James in Acts 15 has been observed. Richard ("The Divine Purpose," 272) and van de Sandt ("An Explanation," 77) have gone a long way toward establishing the relationship between these two chapters with regards to God's turning and returning,

collectively can be seen as creating a metaphoric motif for God's activity in his redemptive-historical plan, for Luke.⁴⁰

First, the metaphor begins in the Lukan Stephen's speech in Acts 7. In Acts 7:42, Stephen begins when Israel rejects God by rejecting his good provision of a prophet, Moses.⁴¹ As a result, in 7:42 he says, "God *turned* and gave them over" (ἐστρεψεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκεν;). For the Lukan Stephen, God turned from Israel corporately, and as the LXX-Amos 5 quotation elucidates, when God turns from Israel, he gives them over completely to their pattern of habitual idolatry (7:43). Israel's rejection of God's provision of a prophet in the Exodus is made an analogy to their rejection of Jesus in their present-day for a perverted temple. The result for the Lukan Stephen is that the Jews of his day will face a similar fate as their ancestors, namely, the punishment for idolatry—being "sent beyond Damascus" (cf. Deut. 4:25–28). This fate is for those who commit Israel's enduring error of turning from God's plan (7:35–37, 51–53), which is most recently and ultimately manifested in rejecting God's Messiah.

Secondly, in Acts 13:46 the next decisive redemptive-historical turn is highlighted. God turns to the Gentiles as prophecy confirms both from the prophet Habakkuk and Isaiah (στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη). The Jews of Antioch fulfill the self-fulfilling prophecy of LXX-Hab. 1:5 by their astonished rejection of a foreign nation being used by God for his redemptive purposes. The Gentiles receive salvation freely with no prior commitment to the Law or association with the synagogue (Acts 13:44, 46–48), which is what infuriates the Jews who witness the Gentiles' reception of salvation (13:45) and not the gospel proclamation itself. In response to the jealous rejection of God's plan to receive the Gentiles *as Gentiles*, Paul reminds them that prophecy has foretold that the gospel would be preached to them first as it was preached to them the previous week, but that it was also in God's plan all along that the Gentiles receive salvation. Regrettably, the sign of the reception by the Gentiles would be a corporate turn from the gospel by the Jews. Paul says,

and motifs of building and rebuilding. See also my work on this relationship in White, "Revisiting," 82–85.

40 The concept of a "spatial-relational metaphor" is one that is utilized in order to give an appropriate picture of how God's "turning" and "returning" affects his relationship by use of a metaphor of presence or space. This is not an original observation. Richard relates στρέφω-stemmed words in Acts (7:39, 42; 15:16; cf. also 13:46; 14:15; 15:19) to "spatial imagery" ("The Divine Purpose," 272). For more on other metaphors used in NT literature concerning spatial-relationships, cf. e.g., Aaron W. White, "Pauline Rhetoric Revisited: On the Meaning of κολλώμενος in the Context of 1 Cor 6,12–20," *ETL* 9, no. 4 (2014): 751–59.

41 Cf. Richard, "Creative Use," 49.

It was necessary that the word of God be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it aside and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we are turning to the Gentiles. (13:46)

God verifies that it is he who turns to the Gentiles through his emissaries, not according to any human or human agenda but according to his foretold plan in the Lukan Paul's use of Is. 49:6 (τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν).⁴² Luke's goal to make his account of the earliest church and the reason for the events that point to major redemptive-historical moves by God must have God at the center as the primary actor. In both 7:42 and 13:46, God's turning moves his plan forward in significant ways and is affirmed as God's action by a consistent metaphor and verified by buttressing prophecy.

Both of these occurrences of turning, and Luke's choice of στρέφω-stemmed words, serve to illustrate the metaphor and clarify the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:16a. Instead of viewing this textual change as influenced by a web of Scriptural allusion outside of the indicated text of LXX-Amos 9:11–12,⁴³ this instance is an allusion back to Luke's own narrative and a distinctively Lukan reading of his construed LXX-TP (since, of course, the locations of these "turning" words occur in the places where his other TP quotations appear and are appropriated). He recalls two previous "turning" moments in Acts 7 and 13 that are significant in making a crucial redemptive-theological point.

The point is, it is fully revealed at the Council that God returns to rebuild a multi-ethnic people that he calls to seek him. The Gentiles have already been received at the second instance in 13:46, but are in Acts 15 legitimately recognized by the church as part of God's people. Luke's choice to edit out ἀνίστημι in LXX-Amos 9:11 and include ἀναστρέφω first clears up any confusion there might have been that the rebuilding of the tent was symbolic of the resurrection, but more importantly, that the official unction of a multi-ethnic people of God by the early church leaders is not based on their agenda, opinion, or will but on God's foretold plan to return to this new collection of people as his restored people.

42 Fitzmyer's (*Acts*, 521) opinion that Paul's speeches do not represent a turning point in Acts is doubtful. In fact, they do constitute a significant turning point. The Gentiles *as Gentiles* take a role in Acts that has not yet been seen in the narrative, and though Fitzmyer is right in that Paul will repeat in Acts the "first to the Jews and then to the Gentile" approach, this moment in Acts is what makes that pattern possible and legitimate later in Acts (cf. 18:6, 19; 19:8). Cf. also, Conzelmann, *Acts*, 106.

43 Pace Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 163–64.

III.b The Rebuilding of the Tent by God

For Luke, God's return means that he is going to execute a specific work, namely, to rebuild the fallen tent of David. In the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11, ἀνοικοδομέω is the transitive verb that replaces ἀνίστημι and takes on the object ἡ σκηνή. The rebuilding is with one purpose in mind, "so that (ὅπως ἄν) the remnant of mankind may seek the Lord and all the Gentiles who are called by my name" (15:17; cf. 15:14).⁴⁴ According to what the Lukan James says of Peter's testimony in 15:14 and the connection that these testimonies have to the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 (cf. μετὰ ταῦτα), the Lukan appropriation of the LXX-Amos 9 text is an explanation of a present reality.⁴⁵ By God's call (15:14) and the last-days-work of the Lord (15:17), the reconstruction of the tent has reached a point at which the Gentiles are called to seek the Lord like Peter, Paul, and Barnabas have testified.⁴⁶

III.b.1 The Building Activity of God Already in Acts

Much like our previous discussion of "turning" words and the proper context in which to understand the Lukan use of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, there is a similar context that is appropriate to understand the Lukan changes in his reading of this text. As in the Lukan use of ἀναστρέφω at the beginning of the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11, it is likely that what has previously happened in Acts already, especially in Acts 7, provides the correct context in which to understand the Lukan appropriation and change of ἀνίστημι to ἀνοικοδομέω.⁴⁷ For his imagery of divine rebuilding in 15:16–18, Luke is again alluding back to previous themes in Acts 7 and his reading of previous LXX-TP texts for the basis of the reality of Acts 15.

Luke's understanding of the eschatological people of God is of a tent that is divinely constructed.⁴⁸ Luke relates Acts 7 (and 13) with Acts 15 by way of verbal and conceptual contrast in his reading of LXX-TP texts. Already in a previous chapter regarding the Lukan appropriation of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43, we have discussed how the Lukan Stephen identified a pattern of the habitual rejection of God's provision by Israel throughout their history and continued by rejecting the Righteous One, Jesus, in favor of a perverted view of the temple. An essential part of the pattern was revealed by the analogy of the hand-made golden calf (cf. 7:40, ποιήσον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἱ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν;

44 Richard, "Creative Use," 49–50.

45 Cf. Richard, "Creative Use," 49.

46 Cf. Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 396; Glenn, "Apostolic Hermeneutics," 15.

47 Cf. Richard, "Creative Use," 49.

48 Cf. White, "Revisiting," 85–88.

7:41, ἐμοσχοποίησαν, and ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν) with the temple (cf. 7:48, ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ; 7:49, ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε μοι). This "hand-made-ness" has played into Israel's rejection of God's good provisions for them. Conversely, now in Acts 15:16–18, Luke emphasizes the God-made nature of the eschatological tent of David. The tent is restored (ἀνορθώσω) when its ruins are "rebuilt" and it is completely restored by God (cf. 15:16, ἀναστρέψω, ἀνοικοδομήσω, ἀνοικοδομήσω, ἀνορθώσω).

III.b.2 The Rebuilding Activity of God in Acts 15 and Its Restoration

With the clear emphasis on "rebuilding" of the "tent of David" in the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, some have expressed difficulty understanding why Luke would have replaced an instance of ἀνοικοδομέω with ἀνορθώσω (cf. 15:16b, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν).⁴⁹ In connection with the Lukan redaction of LXX-9:11 ἀνίστημι earlier in 15:16, others have suggested reasons for the change noted above by connecting it with complex scriptural allusions by Luke to other Greek Old Testament texts and the contexts of the supposed Greek Scriptures.⁵⁰ However, the reason for the changes in the verbs and the editing in the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:16 is most plausibly related to the desire to simplify the cumbersome LXX-Amos 9:11 source text that may otherwise distract focus from the goal of the Lukan use of the text.⁵¹

Luke omits two phrases from LXX-Amos 9:11–12. The first is after the description of the "fallen-ness" of the tent of David. The phrase "and I will rebuild what is fallen" (καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς) from LXX-Amos is left out. The second phrase edited out from LXX-Amos is after God's promise to restore the "tent." The phrase is God's promise to "rebuild [the tent] as it was in the days of old" (καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος).⁵² Luke seems to be concerned about keeping the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 to its integral parts while keeping "rebuilding" in the spotlight.⁵³ In light of this, the

49 In fact, as we will observe below, Luke transposes ἀνοικοδομήσω to an earlier place than it is in LXX-Amos 9:11b, replacing ἀναστήσω, and in the place where ἀνοικοδομήσω once stood in 9:11b, in Acts 15:16b, ἀνορθώσω now stands. Here is that phrase for reference from LXX-Amos 9:11b (καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν) and Acts 15:16b (καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν).

50 Glenny, "Apostolic Hermeneutics," 19–20; Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 157–60.

51 Cf. Richard, "Creative Use," 49; Barrett, *Acts*: 15–28, 725.

52 It seems that the idea of the "earliest times" (αἰῶνος) in the second edit may be found in the end of the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:12 (which will be discussed later). Holladay supposes a similar possibility (*Acts: A Commentary* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016], 300nC).

53 Cf. Marshall, "Acts," 592.

transitive ἀνοικοδομήσω that has the “tent” as its object is recouped from Luke’s first edit (i.e., καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς) and used as a source for the ἀνοικοδομέω that partially replaces ἀνίστημι earlier in 15:16. Luke’s reading of the text replaces ἀνοικοδομήσω with ἀναστήσω so that the rebuilding of the tent is not confused with the resurrection, as it has been suggested already. Luke’s verb of choice in Acts to image the resurrection is ἀνίστημι.⁵⁴

As for the second phrase edited by Luke (i.e., καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν ...), Luke inserts the verb ἀνορθόω. The first and most obvious reason for this redaction appears to be that if Luke retained the instance of ἀνοικοδομέω where in 15:16 ἀνορθώσω now stands (cf. 15:16, καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν; LXX-Amos 9:11, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν), his language would become redundant. If Luke retained the third ἀνοικοδομέω, the verse would read (with added emphasis), “... I will *rebuild* the tent of David that has fallen, I will *rebuild* its ruins, and I will *rebuild* it.” The term ἀνοικοδομέω, after these Lukan redactions to LXX-Amos 9:11, would then appear three times and in the end, become superfluous. Instead, Luke says when God rebuilds (2×) the tent, it is then defined as “restored” (ἀνορθόω) in the final phase of the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11 (much like the result of an equation).

The word ἀνορθόω only occurs three times in the NT, and two are in Luke-Acts. In Luke 13:13 it is used to illustrate the restored body of a disabled woman, translated as “immediately she was *restored*” (παραχρήμα ἀνωρθώθη), but literally: “immediately her health was made straight.” It is hard to get to a place of complete precision on this word according to the Lukan use owing to its limited occurrence or to know precisely why Luke would have chosen it as the word that would break up redundancy. The probable solution is that it is a verb that makes for a fitting conclusion to 15:16 and indeed to the problem introduced by Acts 7 in that God restores what was exiled, fallen and in ruins. This is the best solution in light of how the verb ἀνορθόω often in reference to the establishment of the reign of David and Luke’s reference to the restoring of David’s tent (cf. LXX-2 Sam. 7:13; LXX-Chron. 17:8–7; 22:5; LXX-Ps. 17:36).⁵⁵

In sum, the tent of David imagery, drawn on by the Lukan James’ quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11, lays an essential foundation for the final part of his quotation. The Lord alone acts, returns, rebuilds, and restores. Luke has woven vital themes through Acts in order to prepare his reader for this moment in

54 Throughout Acts, ἀνίστημι is frequently used in order to illustrate the resurrection (cf. 2:24, 32; 3:22 [7:37] in analogy to 3:26; 10:41; 13:33, 34; 17:3, 31), outside the many instances when it is used in reference to the action of standing up, addressing a crowd, sitting up, or beginning an action or a journey.

55 Cf. also, Glenny, “Apostolic Hermeneutics,” 19–20.

Acts 15:16. It is a pinnacle moment of resolution for many important themes in Acts 1–15. It is now for 15:17 to tell the reason (ὅπως) for the Lord’s actions and what it means for the rest of Acts and indeed the end of history.

III.C *The Tent of David and the Gentiles*

For the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, the term ὅπως signals that what came before it was for a purpose that follows. For the Lukan James’ exegesis of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, ὅπως (plus the subjunctive) indicates a relationship between the divinely reconstructed and restored tent of David (Acts 15:16) and the divine call of a people that will seek him (15:17). Necessary for our purposes of observing the programmatic role that LXX-Amos 9:11–12 has for the rest of Acts is what the tent of David represents and how that fulfills prophecy. Upon this one word, ὅπως, the narrative of Acts pivots, and a new reality for the church is revealed by James’ judgment. Also becoming more evident is the programmatic use of this text by the culmination of earlier themes in Acts at this important redemptive-historical turning point. For our case, in particular, it is important that these culminating themes come explicitly from locations in Acts that appropriate LXX-TP texts, suggesting a plausible case of an intentional Lukan construal of a particular corpus into a distinctive, logical whole in the Lukan reading. But we have to ask what the end of this culmination is meant to demonstrate and prepare the student of Acts for in the rest of the narrative.

III.C.1 A People for My Name

In 15:14, the Lukan James connects the experience of Peter and his testimony to the direction of the Holy Spirit in 15:7–10 (also, 15:28) to his exegesis of LXX-Amos 9:11–12. He says, “Simeon has related how God first visited the Gentiles to take from them a people for his name” (Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). The origin of this phrase has been debated.

For some, James’ words in 15:14, “people for my name,” share some similarities with words from the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy 14:2 (... σὲ ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς) and 26:18–19 (καὶ κύριος εἵλατό σε σήμερον γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον ... καὶ εἶναί σε ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὡς ἐποίησέν σε ὀνομαστὸν καὶ καύχημα καὶ δόξαστόν ...) both express God’s choice of Israel out of the rest of the people in the land as his holy people.⁵⁶ Neither occasion shares complete verbal agreement with Acts 15:14, and specifically, Marshall notes that

56 Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 502; Marshall, “Acts,” 589.

the similarity ends at the point at which the reader realizes that Deuteronomy is in relation to the people Israel and not “a group of people *out of the Gentile nations*,” as Acts 15:14 has it.⁵⁷ Relatedly, Bock says that these verses “picture a call to Gentiles [in Acts 15:14–18] similar to the one Israel experienced.”⁵⁸ And finally in broad agreement with Marshall and Bock, Dupont has suggested that it is a phrase that is the Lukan James’ own, though attributing much to what he calls a “couleur biblique.”⁵⁹

Finding its location in close relation to Luke’s general Jewish milieu, Dahl has suggested that the phrase “people for my name” is an expression with targumic-Aramaic origin. Dahl also suggests that the saying probably dates back to early Jewish Christianity.⁶⁰ Dahl’s Jewish-Christian assertion has been critiqued for its lack of evidence,⁶¹ but his targumic claim has been supported by the discovery of the evidence in Neofiti 1 on Ex. 19:5–6 and 22:30.⁶²

None of the claims from above match the Lukan James’ meaning exactly, but they all at some level line up with his underlying intention. The debate concerning the source of James’ words in 15:14 is not inconsequential in that it continues to demonstrate that the lens through which Luke saw the world was the lens of Scripture. However, vis-a-vis the intentional connection, 15:14 has with 15:17, the value of a firm conclusion on the specific text source for 15:14 diminishes for understanding the Lukan context since it seems that Luke is creating his narrative context to which he can allude as it develops.

The Lukan James seems to be seeking to introduce the quotation of LXX-Amos 9:12 with a similar phrase to that found in the quotation. James says in 15:17 that the restoration of the tent of David by the Lord will enable the eschatological seeking of the Lord⁶³ by “all the nations called by my name” (καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς, 15:17). This phrase also closely agrees with the Lukan Peter’s words of 2:39. The phrase ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (“everyone whom the Lord our God calls to himself”) in 2:39 is modified by πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν (“all who are far off”).

57 Marshall, “Acts,” 589. Italics original to Marshall.

58 Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 502. With Barrett, *Acts*: 15–28, 724.

59 Jacques Dupont, “LAOS EX ETHNŌN (Acts XV.14),” *NTS* 3 (1956): 48–49.

60 Nils Dahl, “A People for His Name (Acts XV.14),” *NTS* 4, no. 4 (1958): 319–27. Richard (“The Divine Purpose,” 280 n33) concludes with a similar position.

61 Richard, “The Divine Purpose,” 280 n33.

62 Cf. Richard, “The Divine Purpose,” 280 n33; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 502.

63 Luke’s inserts τὸν κύριον for the assumed object of “me” in LXX-Amos 9:12. Cf. Marshall, “Acts,” 592.

Elsewhere in Scripture, the language of "all who are far off" (Eph. 2:13, 17) or "ends of the earth" (Lk. 11:31b) is used idiomatically for the Gentile nations.⁶⁴

For James, the emphasis is upon God's divine initiative to visit the Gentile nations through the rebuilding and restoration of the eschatological tent of David in order to gather a group of them for his name. God's expected visitation of his people is an eschatological expectation, but according to the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, James explains that Peter's experience and Scripture indicate that the eschatological moment is now and that God's λαός includes the Gentiles as a people associated now with those Jews who are under Jesus' lordship as was forecast early in his gospel (cf. Lk. 1:68b; 7:16).⁶⁵

The inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of God, for Lukan James in 15:14–17, is indicated by a relationship between the word λαός and ἔθνος; the former normally is reserved for describing ethnic Israel and the latter for those outside of Israel. For James, God has taken from the ἔθνος a λαός. Often in Luke-Acts, λαός is used to denote the Jewish populace or the people of God (cf. e.g., Lk. 1:10; 19:47; Acts 7:34; 13:17; see also LXX examples, Deut. 26:18–19; 32:8–9; Ps. 135:12).⁶⁶ But Luke is affirming what Peter has also said in 15:10–13 that is used in James' judgment. Specifically, Peter said that God gave to the Gentiles "the Holy Spirit just as he did to us," therefore, God makes "no distinction between us and them."

The expectation that the Gentiles would be enlightened (φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνῳν) by the truth that comes in the Messiah and Lord, Jesus, and to the glory of God's λαός (καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ) can be found early in Luke's gospel, in the Nunc Dimittis (Lk. 2:29–32). Such enlightening seems to associate the nations with the people of God in a fresh way.

In Luke 2:29–32, the Lukan Simeon gives a prophecy about Jesus' ministry. Alluding to Isaiah 52:10, he refers to "all people" (πάντων τῶν λαῶν) to whom salvation is offered ("salvation," σωτήριος, is calling upon the Lord Jesus' name in this context) is given. Only on one other occasion does Luke use the plural of λαός (Acts 4:25–27), and that is in reference to corporate Israel.⁶⁷ However, in the context of Luke 2:31, τῶν λαῶν embraces both Gentiles and Israel.⁶⁸ Luke 2:32 makes this clear, saying, "[the salvation (Jesus) is] a light for revelation to the Gentiles ..." Nolland is instructive in observing the redemptive-historical move that this text makes. He says, "[this text] recognizes that the Gentiles come

64 Cf. Loader, "Explanation," 277.

65 Chance, *The Temple*, 98. On Lk. 1:68 and its relationship to Acts 15:14, see Dupont, "LAOS," 48.

66 Richard, "The Divine Purpose," 279 n32. Cf. Dahl, "People," 326.

67 Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 120.

68 Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 120.

to the light from pagan darkness while Israel is already God's People and by God's gracious commitment destined for glory."⁶⁹ What Peter observed earlier in Acts 15 and Simeon prophesied early in Luke's gospel is being realized now by the exegesis of the Lukan James in 15:14–18.⁷⁰

In sum, the Lukan James is working to indicate that there is agreement between the apostles' experience of the divine initiative to the Gentiles, as Peter testifies specifically, and the words of the prophets concerning the Lord's work to enable the Gentile inclusion into the people of God. Such agreement legitimizes the entrance of Gentiles qua Gentiles and the resulting multi-national church, which is predicated upon God's eschatological visitation (i.e., restoration and rebuilding of the tent of David, 15:15).

III.C.2 The Nature of the Eschatological Tent of David in Acts 15:16

The intended referent of the "tent of David" has also been a topic of debate. There are five typical views that are held. Strauss helpfully lays out these views, which we will review and of which we will give an interpretation.⁷¹

1) The tent of David has been viewed, primarily by Jervell and his Scandinavian School, as the eschatologically restored Israel, which is comprised of all the Jews who have received Jesus as Messiah. According to this view, the Gentiles are an "associate people" with the Jewish Christians under the larger umbrella of the people of God.⁷² That is, Jews and Gentiles remain distinct people under the lordship of Jesus. We will discuss this view further and its opponents further below.

2) A majority has held that the "tent" is in reference to the restoration of true Israel, which, contrary to Jervell et al., is made up of both Jew and Gentile. Bauckham articulates this view as the tent being the Temple of the messianic age, which is the Christian community. For Bauckham, the eschatological temple as the Christian community is a point made explicitly by Luke.⁷³ Bauckham's argument is not one to be dismissed lightly since it is thoroughly

69 Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 120.

70 Here we observe an allusion to a previous episode early in Luke's gospel. When the Lukan James refers to Peter by his Aramaic name "Simeon" just before making his judgment to allow the Gentiles qua Gentiles into the people of God, it could likely be an intentional connection between the prophecy of Simeon in Luke 2 and its fulfillment witnessed (with emphasis on his testimony) by another "Simeon" in Acts 15.

71 For this discussion, see Strauss, *Messiah*, 187–92. Glennly follows Strauss. Cf. Glennly, "Apostolic Hermeneutics," 18–20.

72 Cf. esp. Jervell, *Luke*, 51–54.

73 Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 157–69, 181–82. Cf. also, Chance, *The Temple*, 35–35; G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove: Apollos; IVP, 2004), 235, 238.

argued and convincing in its argument from possible allusions by Luke to the Hebrew Scriptures. However, his argument rests too heavily upon allusions that would not be immediately evident to Luke's readers. The problem this causes is that Luke has used some slightly negative rhetoric about the Jewish attitude toward the temple in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 7:47–53), and if he wanted his reader to understand the Gentile inclusion through a hermeneutic of the eschatological temple, his appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 alone would not be sufficient. Luke would need to make his argument clearer in these verses with further comment rather than merely by complex allusions to other texts of Scripture as Bauckham supposes is happening (though again, these allusions are often opaque, and in our estimation would not be precise enough for an audience that wanted to hear with clarity the difference or similarity between "the tent" and "the temple").⁷⁴

3 and 4) With some relation to the second view, a third and fourth view involve the resurrection of Jesus as God's rebuilding and restoration work. The more comprehensive of these views is held by F. F. Bruce, who has suggested that the tent is the plan of God as ultimately manifested in the resurrection of Jesus and the establishment of the Christian church.⁷⁵ Haenchen's view is similar but is based more conservatively around a Christological interpretation of the tent in relation to the resurrection. He views the tent as the fullness of the story of Jesus ("as adumbrating the story of Jesus") that culminates in the resurrection. For Haenchen, this leads to the fulfillment of the promise made to David that causes the seeking of the Gentiles.⁷⁶ The problem with these views is the resurrection aspect. In Acts alone, Luke frequently refers to the lordship of Christ by referencing his raised state by use of ἀνίστημι (2:24; 32; 3:26; 10:41; 13:33, 34; 17:3, 31). However, in 15:16 Luke intentionally edits out ἀνίστημι twice. His purpose in doing so is to emphasize God's return and God's rebuilding over God's raising which is how the normative text would have it. Elsewhere in Acts,

74 Glenn objects to Bauckham's view on grammatical grounds, based on the order of the building of the tent and the seeking of the Gentiles. Glenn correctly observes that ὅπως ἂν requires a differentiation between the building of the tent and the seeking of the Gentiles. This means for Glenn that the seeking of the Gentiles cannot be part of the rebuilding process, but only a result of its rebuilt state. Generally Glenn's view is acceptable, though one might suggest that it is not simply the Gentiles that seek, but "the remnant of mankind" ("Apostolic Hermeneutics," 19–20).

75 F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 310.

76 Haenchen, *Acts*, 448.

Luke's emphasis is God's work of raising his messiah via ἀνίστημι but not here. This causes serious problems for this view.⁷⁷

5) A fifth view is the most comprehensive in view of God's plan for redemptive history in Acts. The view of Glennly and Strauss is that "the restoration of the Davidic dynasty accomplished through life, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus" is the referent of the tent.⁷⁸ The tent, therefore, is not the church or Israel but the kingly reign of Jesus, which fulfills the promise of God to David. Glennly appeals to the interpretation of 4QFlor and the Targum rendering of Amos 9:12 as two corroborating texts that give evidence of an interpretation that may have influenced the Lukan understanding of the tent.⁷⁹

4QFlor, which will be observed with more considerable attention below, says, "... And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen." The Targum rendering is, "At that time, I will set up again the kingdom of the house of David that has fallen." While Glennly's and Strauss' view are pretty close to how the data reads, there are two points at which their views have problems.

First, their appeal to other Jewish texts with the tacit priority over the Lukan text is hermeneutically problematic in view of how reception happens (this is covered in the section on method section in the introduction). But more significantly, their emphasis upon the reign of Jesus ignores that God is restoring something, namely, the tent. It is true that Jesus is established as a regal Lord, but this is the burden of Acts 2. In the end, what is being restored has to have been lost at some point, and this is not the case if we are speaking of Jesus' reign.

The referent for the tent of David is a difficult thing to pin down. However, if we follow the flow of Acts 15, the choice is made more apparent for us. It seems that among some good options that Jervell's view is better.⁸⁰ In agreement with Strauss and Glennly, the works of Jesus are of vital importance to the proceedings of the Council and are, indeed, the truth that carries their final decision

77 In his critique of Haenchen's view, Jervell (*Luke*, 52) notes that Haenchen's view does not regard the Lukan quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11 as having any relevance to his quotation of 9:12, in Acts 15:17. However, it is Jervell's following comment that is problematic. He says in response to Haenchen that "Obviously, one cannot expect too much logic in the use of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament writings." Jervell's statement is a tendentious one and in fact sounds contrary to other statements he has made about the normative use of Scripture by Luke elsewhere (*Apostelgeschichte*, 397. My translation). In the end, Jervell is probably referring to a bigger picture of many enigmatic quotations by Luke and other NT authors, but the statement is too sweeping, and seems to assume that since some quotations are unclear in their intention they are necessarily illogical.

78 Strauss, *Messiah*, 190.

79 Glennly, "Apostolic Hermeneutics," 20–21.

80 Contra, Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, 502; Glennly, "Apostolic Hermeneutics," 18.

(cf. Acts 15:10, 19).⁸¹ However, the burden of the chapter is more accurately an ecclesiological one that informs the soteriological rather than Christological (or Messianic). The question has always been: how are the Gentiles part of the people of God in a legitimate way, and what does this say about their salvation? James answers this question in 15:16 when he places his emphasis on the restoration (ἀνορθόω) of the tent, which leads to (ὅπως ἄν) the seeking of the Gentiles.⁸² The seeking of the Gentiles who are called by the name of the Lord is part of Luke's argument for certainty. The seeking of the nations is proof of the restoration of eschatological Israel which was promised to David and is evidenced by the claim of God's ultimate return to his eschatological people after a time of exile.⁸³ God fulfills a promise to Israel for a restored people of God by virtue of a rebuilt Davidic dynasty by calling a people set apart for his name as the Lukan James explains with LXX-Amos 9:12 (cf. e.g., Zech. 2:14–17; Lk. 2:29–32; Acts 2:39; 3:25; 13:47).⁸⁴ This seems to be the contention of the Lukan James. The divine rebuilding of the tent, therefore, is the restoration of the people of God under their Messiah, the Lord Jesus. The first 14 chapters of Acts, giving specific attention to the Lukan construal of the LXX-TP at important turning points, prepare the reader to see in the rest of Acts the seeking of the Lord Jesus by the remainder of humankind, as they are being restored to God as part of his people. The latter, of course, is what Acts 16–28 emphasizes, with the Pauline mission often being based at the local synagogue, the location where Israel is to be sought in the diaspora (the synagogue is the Lukan Paul's base for mission in the rest of Acts) and then reaching the ends of the earth and those far off in fulfillment of Acts 1:8 and 2:39.

In the end, this view best accords with the movement of Acts 15, and, indeed, of Acts 1–15. It also wards off any notion, because of misplaced emphasis on the Christological, that the Gentile mission was the result of a failed mission to the Jews.⁸⁵ Jervell correctly says that if James' judgment is read this way, it demonstrates that "The continuity of salvation history does not lie exclusively in the history of Jesus but also in the people who represent Israel."⁸⁶ In other words, God's people are just as much a work of God's hands as those works done through his Messiah. God is the one who has built eschatological

81 Jervell (*Luke*, 53) concedes this point, but places the burden correctly on the ecclesiological and soteriological points.

82 Cf. Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 165.

83 Jervell, *Luke*, 60. Cf. Dahl, "People," 326.

84 Cf. Jervell, *Luke*, 53.

85 Jervell, *Luke*, 53. Contra Dahl, "People," 327.

86 Jervell, *Luke*, 53.

Israel which enables his current selection of a people for his name from the Gentiles (Acts 15:10, 14, 17, 19).⁸⁷

III.d Acts 15:18: “Known from of Old”

The Lukan James concludes his judgment with a phrase foreign to the end of LXX-Amos 9:12. James finishes the quotations: “says the Lord, who does these things, known from of old” (λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος). It is the final phrase that is an addition to the quotation from LXX-Amos 9:12 (γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος). By this final phrase, including the declaration that it is from the mouth of the Lord, James is closing the Lukan case for the inclusion of the Gentiles into the eschatological people of God and closing his construal of the LXX-TP that means to demonstrate the universality of the lordship of Jesus and its implications. Moving forward, no longer will any appeal to Scripture reveal further insight into the Gentile inclusion in Acts until the Lukan Paul’s reaffirmation of the universal nature of the people of God via the Gentile mission in Acts 28:25–28.

The phrase in 15:18, γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος is how Luke chooses to close his quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12. This phrase is one typically viewed as alluding to

87 More can be said regarding the view we take here on the nature of the “tent of David,” especially concerning the distinction it makes between Jewish-Christians and Gentile-Christians. Specifically, Glenny (“Apostolic Hermeneutics,” 17) says a view like mine, following Jervell in large part, “builds a distinction ... that is foreign to the context of Acts 15 and the rest of the NT (Eph 2).” However, Glenny may be mistaken here. Acts 15, reflecting earlier portions of Acts (esp. 10:10–16; 11:15), does naturally express distinction. Twice in Acts 15, Peter refers to “us and them”; “us” representing ethnically Jewish-Christians, and “them” as the Gentile-Christians (15:8, ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν; 15:9, ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν; cf. 10:10–16; 11:15). While the distinction causes problems for the early church, among the apostles (cf. e.g., 10:10–16), and their opponents (13:45–51; 15:1), Luke seems to retain the distinction. In a related way, the stipulations of the Apostolic Decree (15:19–21, 29) are applied to the Gentile-Christians uniquely, as part of the law they must observe in continuity with “the law of the resident alien” from Lev. 17–18 (cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 557; Jervell, *Theology*, 59–60; Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 172–75; Schnabel, *Mission*, 1017. For other views concerning the origin of the Apostolic Decree see Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: 15:1–23:35* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014], 2260–69; Aaron W. White, “Reading Inclusion Backwards: Considering the Apostolic Decree Again in Fresh Perspective,” *BTB* 48, no. 4 [2018]: 202–14). But the Gentile-Christian has been freed from circumcision (13:38–39; 15:10, 19, 28). But the Jewish-Christian, for Luke, remains under the law, cf. e.g., 16:3, and that 15:10, 19, 28 never claim their freedom from the “yoke.” Both of these distinctions, important to the context of the Council in Acts 15, would suggest the distinction exists among the Jewish-Christians and the Gentile-Christians that stand side-by-side in the eschatological people of God. More could still be said on this, but suffice it to say that distinction is expected in the eschatological people of God and seen in the Lukan context.

LXX-Is. 45:21 (specifically, ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς).⁸⁸ However there is reason to doubt that Luke was alluding to a single text like Isaiah 45:21. Instead, he is more likely appealing to a generally known prophetic pattern.

The reason for casting doubt upon this supposed allusion begins with the fact that it does not even really line up with the language of Is. 45:21.⁸⁹ It seems that the text and context of Isaiah 45:21 and that of Acts 15:18 are actually saying different things. In fact, Barrett takes a hard line on this suggesting that "James' version makes what appears to be the point more strongly than does the LXX (of Isaiah) ..." ⁹⁰ Better explanations are possible.

First, the phrase καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος in LXX-Amos 9:12 bears some thematic resemblance and is possibly a source for the phrase that closes the Lukan quotation of LXX-Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:18 (γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος).⁹¹ Some have suggested that Luke removed καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος from LXX-Amos 9:11 so as to avoid any confusion with the old Temple. This is close to the point. Luke did not remove the phrase but transposed the meaning of the phrase to the end of the quotation with a similar thrust as LXX-Amos 9:11 had in its use of the phrase, namely, affirming the restoring work of the Lord by rebuilding what had once stood in past generations. What Luke does is move the phrase to a more relevant place that serves to demonstrate that whole of the prophecy quoted by the Lukan James, namely, the divine rebuilding of the tent of David and the resulting Gentile seeking is not a new development invented for the specific context of the Council by James, but a promise fulfilled from long ago in that specific context.⁹²

The student of Acts recognizes the primary role speeches take in Acts (and Luke's gospel also), but further that Luke portrays his speakers as prophets of God's redemptive-historical plan.⁹³ The Lukan James plays this role in Acts by

88 Cf. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 117; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 556; Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 164–65, along with most other commentaries.

89 Barrett, *Acts*: 15–28, 728. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 556.

90 Barrett, *Acts*: 15–28, 728.

91 Again, Cf. Holladay, *Acts*, 300nC.

92 Barrett, *Acts*: 15–28, 728.

93 The apostles as prophets will not here be elaborated. However, their prophetic role is one that has been recognized in scholarship. Cf. e.g., Patrick Fairbairn, *The Interpretation of Prophecy* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1993), 11; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 17–18. It is sufficient to note the important work of Johnson (*Luke*, 17–18) who says that "The characters in Acts who fundamentally advance the plot (Peter, John, Philip, Stephen, Barnabas and Paul) are not called prophets ... Instead, Luke describes his main characters in stereotypical language which clearly demarcates them as prophets." Johnson says that the things include "filled with the Holy Spirit," "bold" in proclamation, "proclaims 'Good News' ... or 'the Word of God,'" "each

making the official judgment of the early church on the Gentile inclusion, a climactic judgment for the first 15 chapters of Acts. Luke makes James' judgment one that is originating from the mouth of the Lord.

In his classic work on biblical prophecy, Patrick Fairbairn says that it was the job of the prophet not to say "anything essentially new."⁹⁴ Rather, the prophet's task and calling was to "make it patent to all that he stood on the old foundations ..." ⁹⁵ Keener points out that most thinkers in the milieu of the writers of the NT (Greco-Roman, Jewish, and otherwise) would have found innovation suspicious, placing almost as a rule the highest value on ancient custom.⁹⁶ This is exactly what the inclusion of the Gentiles means for the Council in Jerusalem, an old message fulfilled according to the Lukan James' exegesis of LXX-Amos 9:11–12.

To make the point clearer, Luke in 15:18 does something that Fairbairn says was not generally the practice of the apostles when performing their prophetic role. According to Fairbairn, "[the apostles in their prophetic role] deemed it unnecessary to preface their discourses with the wonted formula of the prophets, 'Thus saith the Lord.'"⁹⁷ Or as Jervell has said, "What is important is not when things happened, but if what actually happened has its roots in the past, 'from of old' ([Acts] 3:21; 15:7, 18, 21)."⁹⁸ For emphasis here in Acts 15:18, however, the Lukan James appears as the exception that proves the rule in that he says that the multi-ethnic church under the lordship of Jesus is from the mouth of the Lord (λέγει κύριος 15:17).

Further, a key element of the Lukan James' judgment is the testimony of Peter, Paul and Barnabas. He explicitly refers to Peter's testimony (and the work of the Holy Spirit included in Peter's recounting) and the agreement with Scripture. The testimony of the Lukan Peter is strong evidence for the prophetic message of James. James is charged as a prophet to give "impartial and incorrupt witness declaring what his eyes have seen, and his ears have heard ..." ⁹⁹ Jervell says it best, "Historical experience and scriptural proof flow together; the scripture confirms and legitimates the experience of Peter, and

works 'signs and wonders,'" "Each preaches and performs these wonders 'among the people' (laos) ..."

94 Fairbairn, *Prophecy*, 15.

95 Fairbairn, *Prophecy*, 15.

96 Keener, *Acts*: 3:1–14:28, 1319.

97 Fairbairn, *Prophecy*, 11. Acts 7:49 is the only occurrence of λέγει κύριος in Acts, outside Acts 15:17. However, like Acts 15:17, it is in reference to the place of worship. Only contrary to Acts 15, it is the temple that is made by the hands of men, according to a quotation from Is. 66:1–2. See the discussion above on the shared motifs between Acts 7 and 15.

98 Jervell, "Future," 124.

99 Fairbairn, *Prophecy*, 15.

the experience of Peter confirms the scripture."¹⁰⁰ James' judgment is based upon a consensus between the Lukan Peter's, Paul's and Barnabas' experience and Scripture, which enables the church to move forward as a multi-ethnic entity with confidence under the grace and forgiveness in Jesus (15:10) since it is "[the Lord] who [is making] these things known from of old."

III.e *Summary*

Acts 15 and the judgment that is made at the Jerusalem Council that it documents is a climactic moment in Acts. In fact, it is a moment that sets the stage for the second half of the book. Moreover, at the heart of this moment is the Lukan appropriation of LXX-Amos 9:11–12.

The role of this quotation is programmatic for Acts. It is the final quotation in Acts until the close of the book, it heavily relies on the Lukan context that comes before it (more than allusions to other scriptural contexts), and it sets in motion that which follows.¹⁰¹ For the Jerusalem Council, it is the Scripture to which the Lukan James appeals in order to finally settle the debate concerning the inclusion of the Gentiles into the eschatological people of God. Combined, these factors demonstrate the important role this quotation has in the Lukan reading of the LXX-TP and in the development of his narrative.

God has now returned and restored his people by rebuilding the fallen "tent of David." This means his people are returned from exile and restored to the promised Davidic dynasty of the eschatological age. As a result, God fulfills the promise made to Israel that a people would be chosen from among the Gentiles to seek the Lord. The Lukan James establishes this as a prophetic message that has been promised from of old. His judgment is not made for convenience or relevance, but from what the Lord has revealed by the Holy Spirit, in the presence of the apostles, confirmed by Scripture, and importantly for our case in this present study, it points back to and echoes previously quoted LXX-TP texts read by Luke in earlier portions of Acts. For Luke, here end the two main controversies that concerned the first fifteen chapters of Acts: the lordship of Jesus over Israel as God's Messiah, and the inclusion of Gentiles *qua* Gentiles under this same lordship. The Lukan construal of the Greek version of the TP corpus has made this case clear by their placement and their use in fully exegeting important moments of redemptive-history in the Lukan context that is marked, in this instance in James' judgment, by the full realization by the young church of the full extent and implication that it is for all people under the lordship of Jesus in the day of the Lord. Acts proceeds with the Gentile mission assuming

¹⁰⁰ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 396. My translation.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Gaventa, *Acts*, 212.

that these two aspects are fully confirmed by the Holy Spirit and the testimony of Scripture.

IV Amos 9:11 in 4Q Florilegium Frgs. 1–2 and 21, 1

4QFlor contains a partial quotation of Amos 9:11 in 4QFlor (= 4Q174) 1.12.¹⁰² This fragmentary work of Early Jewish interpretation is a midrash interpretation of 2 Sam. 7:10–14 and other supporting texts, including Amos 9:11.¹⁰³ In the first part of the pesher (1.1–9), three temples emerge in the pesher of 2 Sam. 7:10–14 in 4QFlor;¹⁰⁴ (1) The “Temple of Israel”;¹⁰⁵ (2) The “Temple of Men”¹⁰⁶ which is to be replaced by the eschatological temple; but it is (3) the eschatological temple that is the focus of 4QFlor and its reading of texts.

¹⁰² See “selected texts” in the appendices for Hebrew text and translation, drawn heavily from Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 250–53.

¹⁰³ M. Ben-Yashar, “Noch Zum Miqraš ’Ādām in 4Q Florilegium,” *RQ* 10, no. 4 (1981): 587 N2; Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 248. Dimant (“Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 519) calls it a “pesher-like” interpretation.

¹⁰⁴ Of these three temples, the attentive reader of 4QFlor will notice, conspicuously is a missing “fourth temple”; the Second Temple in Jerusalem. For whatever reason, this temple does not seem to play a role in this pesher nor does it seem to be of concern for the sect in this writing. Dimant (“Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 520) believes that the sect’s practice of Torah abiding in a virtual “Temple of Men” does not replace “the actual temple service,” presumably this means, the service at the Jerusalem Temple. Since the text is silent on this topic, it is hard to tell what is believed about this “fourth temple,” for 4QFlor, with reference to 2 Sam. 7:10–14 or Amos 9:11.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. 1.6, *מקדש ישראל*; or, “Sanctuary of Yahweh,” 1.3, (*מקדש יהוה*) that is read from 2 Sam 7:10b It appears, most likely that, 4QFlor appears to be referring to the First Temple (cf. Jer. 51:51, *בני עולה*), that is, the Temple of Solomon. Cf. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 519; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 107.

¹⁰⁶ The “Temple of Men” (*מקדש אדם*) is interpreted from 2 Sam. 7:11a. This temple is the place of worship at which works of the Torah (*מעשי תורה*) are offered instead of literal sacrifices (4QFlor. 1.7; cf. 1QHab 7.11, 8.1; 12.4–5; 1QS 5.21, 6.18). Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 519. Cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, “The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium,” *RQ* 10, no. 1 (1979): 83–91; Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 248 n10. For more on the “works of Torah” according to Qumran literature, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 82–83. There is some disagreement on 1.7 concerning if a particular Hebrew consonant should be read as “works of thanksgiving” (Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, *DSS SE*, 352–53) or “works of Torah.” (Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 250–51 with Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 519–20). The essential difference is if the Hebrew noun should be read with a “ד” or a “ר.” Following Charlesworth who cites 4Q394 (4QMMT) frgs. 3–7 1.5 and 4Q398 (4QMMT) frgs. 11–13 1.6, frgs. 14–17 2.3 we observe the reading of “torah.” The latter two citations, however, are clearer than the first in support of this reading. Cf. also, 4QFlor frgs. 1&3 2.2.

IV.a *The Progression from Temple to Dynasty in 4QFlor*

In two stages, 4QFlor explains the relevance of this eschatological temple for its sect. First, in 1.2 a "house" (הבית), which is the anticipated temple (with particular reference to Exodus 15:17–18 [cf. 1.3], as the *locus classicus* of this place), for 4QFlor, is connected to the "house" (הבית), or the Davidic dynasty, from 2 Sam 7:10b–11 in 1.10. This house is connected as well to the "booth" from Amos 9:11 in 1.12. Second, 2 Sam. 7:10b–11 is treated as eschatological by use of Amos 9:11a by the interpretive connection of two sets of Hebrew verbs.¹⁰⁷

IV.b *Relating Two "Houses"*

First, foundational to the midrash is the connection between the eschatological temple in 1.1–2 and the Davidic dynasty outlined in 1.10–13.¹⁰⁸

The writer connects the hope of 1.2 to the eschatological program of the rebuilt Davidic dynasty in 1.10–13 by the word "house" (בית). The "house" of 1.2 is a house as "building," but this is interpreted by the writer into a "house" as a dynasty in 1.10–13 as the first step in realizing the temple of 1.2.¹⁰⁹ This step means that the house "as temple" when interpreted as a house "as dynasty," for 4QFlor, is much akin to David's hopes in 2 Samuel to build the temple, but instead, a dynasty is built first. After the connection between 1.2 and the eschatological program of 1.10–13 is made, a physical structure fades from view in 4QFlor, though not, one would imagine, from the hope of the community.

By its hopes to cast the building of this dynasty as messianic and eschatological, 4QFlor next makes its first connection (the second connection will be covered next) between 2 Sam. 7 and Amos 9. The "house" in 1.10, as will be established more firmly below by two sets of Hebrew verbs, is connected in 4QFlor 1.12–13 by the structural metaphor of "booth" (סוכה) from Amos 9:11a. Like the building of the "house," the raising of the fallen "booth" is the hope of the sect for an eschatological re-building of the Davidic dynasty.

IV.c *Language of "Raising" of the Eschatological "House" by Two Texts*

Secondly, after figuratively connecting the "houses" of 1.2 and 1.10, 4QFlor introduces the action of an eschatological "raising" by a reading of Amos 9:11a. The writer interprets 2 Sam. 7:12–14 by the intentional use of two Hebrew verbs

107 Cf. John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 106; Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 107. The text 11QTemp 29:8–10 contains an appeal to God constructing the eschatological temple.

108 Cf. Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 249.

109 In the quotation from 2 Sam 7 11c, יבנה ("to build") appears to be an intentional replacement of another verb יעשה ("to make"); that the "house would be "built," not "made," as such.

הקים and העמיד that interpretively relate to Amos 9:11a; both verbs holding a sense of “raising” or “arising.” The verb הקים (“to arise”) is found in 2 Sam. 7:11 and 9:11, and the verb העמיד occurs twice as the language used by 4QFlor in its pesher interpretation that connects the two texts. The case 4QFlor looks to make is for the eschatological sense of the “raising up” of the Davidic dynasty, particularly framed by the raising up of a messianic figure.

The 2 Sam. 7:11c–12b text and the Amos 9:11a text are connected in verbal analogy by the Hebrew verb הקים (“to raise”).¹¹⁰ The language of “raising up” from 2 Sam. 7:12b of a “house” is linked up with the raising up of the eschatological “booth” in Amos 9:11. The reading of Amos 9:11 by the writer of 4QFlor is one that is closely aligned with an interpretive practice called *gezerah shawah*.¹¹¹ This is where “verbal analogy from one verse to another ... [is] applied to separate cases, [whereby] it follows that the same considerations apply to both.”¹¹² By reading the text this way, the writer applies the eschatological aspect of Amos 9:11 to support his new reading of 2 Sam. 7:10–14. Such an appropriation of the text of Amos and the imposition of its eschatological trajectory on 2 Sam. 7 supports the writer’s intention of projecting that eschatological reality onto the promise of a dynasty given by God to David (and built by God) in 2 Sam. 7:10–14 with the effect that the text would no longer be about the past establishment of a dynasty, as 2 Sam. 7 would naturally be read, but a future hope of a rebuilt dynasty in a messianic era.

Next, by use of העמיד,¹¹³ 4QFlor strengthens the relationship between 2 Sam. 7 and Amos 9 in its pesher interpretation. While the sense of “raising” occurs twice in the quoted texts with הקים, 4QFlor chooses to use העמיד in 1.11 and 1.13 as its language for raising to tie in its messianic trajectory.

It is not entirely clear why 4QFlor uses a cognate in these two cases instead of simply using הקים as the word that links these two texts. It may be that the meaning of the verb chosen by the writer (העמיד) sufficiently connects to הקים, and that the senses of the verb gives the messianic figure a more active role in his “arising,” rather than a passive role that הקים gives him in the quotations. Some take this activity to be the active role of the messianic figure in building the eschatological temple in Early Jewish literature (4QFlor being a potential

110 In 2 Sam. 7:12c and Amos 9:11a, according to the MT, הקים appears in the Hif’il perfect. It is the basic meaning of the Hif’il of causation (cf. Joüon-Muraoka, §54d) that is carried over into the 4QFlor use.

111 See discussions of Early Jewish models of interpretation in George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in Its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 8–17, 36–44.

112 Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 20.

113 A Hif’il cognate that carries the sense for “raising.”

example).¹¹⁴ This is not altogether clear from 4QFlor since the "house" connection between 1.2 and 1.10–13 appears to be built by God.

What is clear is that the "arising" verb connects messianic themes in 1.11 and 1.13 to the quoted material that brackets the pericope in question. The messiah, for 4QFlor, is named as the "shoot of David" (cf. Is. 11), is accompanied by the Interpreter of the Torah, and in 1.13 is seen as a savior for his people. These themes are known Early Jewish messianic short-hands.¹¹⁵ For 4QFlor, הקים connects the messianic themes of 1.11 to 2 Sam. 7 and Amos 9 and frames the raising of the dynasty as the arising of the Davidic Messiah.

iv.d Summary

The context of this sect, according to 4QFlor, is one marked by an anticipation informing an active reading of Scripture that supports their hopes of a dynastic "house." Supporting this hope is an Early Jewish interpretation technique of *gezerah shawah* that sees 2 Sam 7:10–14 as an eschatological reality through the lens of a particular reading of Amos 9:11. Further, the interpretation understands the rebuilding of the "house" in terms of a messianic figure. By this interpretive connection, Amos 9:11 becomes more strongly messianic as 2 Sam 7 is seen as eschatological. A subtle but important point is that those welcomed to this house are limited to the sect (cf. 1.3–4; frgs. 1&3.2).

v Luke and 4QFlor: a Discussion among Readers of Amos 9:11 (and 12)

The text of Amos 9:11 is appropriated by both Luke and 4QFlor. Both of our interlocutors read this text with a specific appeal to its eschatological and messianic meaning potential, as well as with a keen eye on what these themes say about a place of worship. For Luke, it is a tent and for 4QFlor an anticipated dynasty (or, "house"), both appealing to the image of the "tent" with distinct trajectories.

The normative text, Amos 9:11, begins the final eschatological oracle in Amos. It is a surprisingly positive ending to an otherwise gloomy and fearful prophecy. On its own, Amos 9:11–12 is about a day when God returns to rebuild what has been torn down, namely, the dynasty of David. Amos says that upon the day of rebuilding, the Lord will join Israel with other nations and that the rebuilding will give them renewed strength and prosperity. The Lord takes center stage for Amos since it would be unimaginable that the nations would

¹¹⁴ Cf. e.g., N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 483–84.

¹¹⁵ Cf. e.g., John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 60–63.

join Israel in a peaceable eschaton unless it was the Lord saying it himself and building that future hope himself.

Overall, our two interlocutors, 4QFlor and Luke, are in continuity with the normative text. They are both reading Amos 9:11 in light of a place of worship, and they are both reading it in light of a hopeful eschatology that points to a better-defined ecclesiology. However, *pace*, a specific tradition of reading this text, a natural reading of Amos would not lead one to a messianic figure,¹¹⁶ but this is precisely the direction both of our interlocutors take Amos 9; the midrash of 2 Sam. 7:10–14 by 4QFlor makes Amos 9:11 messianic, and for Luke, the context of Acts up to Acts 15 makes LXX-Amos 9:11–12 messianic. However, the fact that Amos seems to lack any primary messianic emphasis is not surprising nor should such themes be expected since in the TP messianic themes are rarely an aspect of its eschatology. Instead, it is the Lord who gains attention in the eschatology of the prophets of the TP most often and almost as a rule. For 4QFlor, it is known titles of the messiah and the text of 2 Sam 7, and for Luke's context, that situate Amos 9:11 clearly in a messianic setting.¹¹⁷

For each of the voices in this last “three-way” conversation, the text points to an eschatological place of worship that is realized by virtue of the arising of a messiah and the establishing of a rebuilt Davidic dynasty and built by God. For 4QFlor, Amos 9:11 is connected to a midrash on 2 Sam. 7:10–14 by an example of *gezerah shawah*, which is meant to give clarity to the sect's hope concerning the raising of an eschatological house of David and framed by the arising of a Davidic messianic figure. For Luke, Amos 9:11 is appropriated in the context of the grander narrative of Acts in order to explain and give scriptural warrant to the inclusion of the Gentiles, *as Gentiles*, into the people of God, as it has already been the unofficial practice of the church for some time (and since Acts 9, 10 and 13, most explicitly).

But as we move the conversation with 4QFlor forward, we gain clarity on the nature and referent of the tent of David as discussed in section III.c.2 of this chapter. With particular reference to 4QFlor's and Luke's use of “raising” or “arising” words, we can critique the fifth view by seeing how Luke does and does not use these words in his context, and in comparison with his normative text and 4QFlor.

In its reading of Amos 9:11, 4QFlor has verbal continuity with the normative text by retaining references to “raising up.” It is upon העמיד that 4QFlor

¹¹⁶ Contra, Glenny, *Meaning*, 221–23.

¹¹⁷ We have seen the same interpretive move in our other conversations that “extra-TP” texts have been appealed to in order to bring in a messiah to the conversation, most notably the appeal to Isaiah 11 in TJ 24, and LXX-Ps. 15 and 109 in Acts 2.

constructs its *gezerah shawah* interpretation of 2 Sam. 7 and emphasizes the action of "raising" by its own use of "raising" (הקים). Contrary to 4QFlor, however, Luke very clearly edits out any notion or action of "raising up" and is in this important way intentionally discontinuous with LXX-Amos 9:11. This is caused by his active reading of the text which points in a particular direction that is away from a particular metaphor.

For 4QFlor, the Davidic Messiah is integrally entwined and related to the raising up of the "house and the "tent"/"booth" of David. 4QFlor uses הקים and העמיד in reference to "raising up" of the Davidic dynasty in 1.10–13, which is viewed in terms of the raising of the messiah. This is done by the pesher interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10–14. In two places, 4QFlor intentionally connects the "raising up" (הקים) of a figurative structure in both 2 Sam. 7 and Amos 9 with its own interpretive Hebrew verb that views that structure as the messianic figure and his "arising" (העמיד). For 4QFlor, therefore language of arising is intentionally and repetitively tied to the messiah as that which is being raised. Similarly, another text that Luke earlier engaged in conversation with, *The Testament of Judah* 24, also used language of "arise" in three places in that chapter with direct reference to the messianic figure (cf. 24.1, 5, 6).¹¹⁸

Like 4QFlor, Luke uses ἀνίστημι throughout Acts as the metaphorical language for the resurrection of Jesus and ascension to Lord and as God's demonstration of Jesus as his messiah and Lord.¹¹⁹ The Greek verb, ἀνίστημι, is a Greek equivalent for both Hebrew verbs used by 4QFlor in its reading of the texts in question, but most importantly, it is the Greek verb that the translator of Amos 9:11 chose to use when translating הקים. For Luke, the verb ἀνίστημι is throughout Acts the action that is tied to the resurrection of Jesus and his ascension (cf. 2:24, 32; 3:2 [7:37] in analogy with 3:26; 10:41; 13:33, 34; 17:3, 31). In this way, Luke agrees with his milieu by attributing "arise" or "raising" language to the messiah and the restoration of the Davidic dynasty (cf. Acts 13:29–39). Luke also agrees with his milieu and 4QFlor, that the messiah is active

118 The Testament of Judah says, "And after this there shall arise (ἀνατέλλω) for you a Star of Jacob: And a man shall arise (ἀνίστημι) from my posterity ..." (24.1); "... and from your root shall arise (ἀναλάμπω) a Shoot ..." (24.5); "... and through it will arise (ἀναβαίνω) the rod of righteousness for the nations, to judge and to save all that call on the Lord" (25.6). Translations from James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 801. Cf., also the notes in Charles, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: Translated from the Editor's Greek Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908), 97. Jonge, *Greek Text*.

119 Additionally, it should be noted that besides using ἀνίστημι in Acts as a metaphor for those actions noted above, this verb is also used in more pedestrian ways, such as, the action of standing up, addressing a crowd, sitting up, or beginning an action or a journey.

in the era of the building activity. In agreement with 4QFlor, the raising of this eschatological tent or house is by the industry of God, which we see in 4QFlor 1.10–13,¹²⁰ and Acts 15:16–18, when Jesus is understood to be speaking as Lord.

For both of our interlocutors, the messiah and the restoration of the Davidic dynasty is closely associated with language of “raising up,” and this raising up is by God’s action and proven by unique ties to scriptural prophecy. In both cases, the use of such language is repetitive and has the appearance of intentionality. The comparison of these texts raises questions about the nature of “raising up” language, what it meant in reference to the messiah in the Early Jewish milieu, and how they might have read a messiah out of a text like Amos 9:11; a text that is, again, not on its face “messianic.”

In this way, we can agree with view five that sets forth the view that the full work of Christ (as Paul proclaims in Acts 13:29–39) is what rebuilds the Davidic dynasty, and 4QFlor is similar. However, Luke’s narrative has moved past this part of the storyline. It has been established that Jesus is the Lord and Christ as prophesied by David (Acts 2) and that he will take the throne of David as king (Acts 13). What view five misses is that Acts 15 asks the ecclesiological question, not a Christological one: What does this all mean for the Gentiles who do not at any level have an association with the Law of Moses and the synagogue? In fact, in Acts 15 Luke is telling of the moment when the church is grasping a reality that the sect writing 4QFlor had not yet understood: the building of the eschatological tent itself.¹²¹ And this is seen in Luke’s active reading of the text of LXX-Amos 9:11–12.

Vis-a-vis his intentional and repeated metaphorical use of ἀνίστημι in the parts of Acts building up to Acts 15, Luke intentionally edits out “raising” language in LXX-Amos 9:11. In review, Luke replaces ἀνίστημι with ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομέω putting the emphasis on returning and rebuilding.¹²² What this leads one to ask: If Luke wanted to continue his metaphor for the messiah, had the choice of texts, and chose LXX-Amos 9:11, which contains ἀνίστημι, why does he take the verb out of the text?

120 More accurately, in 1.2 and 1.10, 4QFlor frames the work of God for the messiah.

121 The reader is directed back to the interpretive move made by 4QFlor and the explanation of it in section v of this chapter. Namely, that in 1.2, 4QFlor speaks of a hoped-for eschatological temple, but that they decide to interpret the term “house,” not as a building as such, but as a dynasty. In sum, the sect first believed the Davidic dynasty had to be rebuilt in terms of the arising of the messiah, and though the text of 4QFlor does not address it, there would naturally seem to be a continued hope for the eschatological temple first noted in 1.2.

122 Cf. Richard, “Creative Use,” 49.

In the rest of Acts, the messiah is "raised up" in connection with the resurrection and then ascension to his lordship to establish his reign, and if Luke wanted to be in harmony with the reading of his interlocutors (and confirm the suggestion of view five), then Amos 9:11 would be a good text to make Jesus' dynastic tent. But as we saw above in Acts 15:16–18, no such "raising up" is present, but rather an act of building¹²³ and restoring. In fact, such language is actively read from the normative text and replaced.

By such editing, the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11 is explicitly about what it is not about vis-a-vis the normative text, 4QFlor (and TJ 24). That is, it is *not* directly about the rebuilding of a dynasty in terms of the resurrection and ascension of the messiah as it has been more directly in the rest of his narrative. *Rather*, it is about the building of an eschatological tent, or an eschatological people. This is the question discussed at the Jerusalem Council. The quotation is framed as "the Jews first" (e.g., 15:16) "so that" the Gentiles may follow. That is, the dynasty of Israel has been established so that the Gentiles may come under the same tent, associated with the Jewish Christian by virtue of the same Lord they serve and in whom they both find salvation.¹²⁴ As Dahl and Jervell say, the promise of God to Israel of a rebuilt dynasty, a promise even 4QFlor claims, leads to conversion of the Gentiles.¹²⁵ By virtue of this, the Gentiles share in the promises of Israel and the full implications of the lordship of Jesus are realized as expected long ago (cf. 15:18) as the prophets agree. The "far off" and "ends of the earth" people are reached as the Lukan Jesus promised (Acts 1:8) and Peter foretold (2:39) and is now fulfilled in Acts 15.

Finally, an emphasis for 4QFlor (though only mentioned in passing) is the exclusivity of the eschatological temple. But, as we have seen above, Luke disagrees. This answers Conzelmann, who asked why Luke might not have simply established a new order of Christian God-fearers.

In our conversation, a clear difference is revealed in answering this question that reveals how far Luke has now distinguished himself from his interlocutors regarding the ecclesiological makeup of the people of God. For 4QFlor the people for whom the eschatological dynasty is rebuilt is expressly *not of the nations*

123 In fact, it is interesting to observe how the Hebrew verb יָבַנָּה ("to build") is associated with the expected eschatological temple in 4QFlor 1.2. It is not said to be "raised" but "built." Like Luke, the messiah is "raised" but the temple or tent is "built." This is not an airtight parallel, since in 4QFlor 1.10, the "house" as dynasty is also said to be "built," but the reader will remember, that house is no longer speaking of the eschatological temple, but the dynasty in terms of the messiah. However, in the quotation from 2 Sam 7 11c, יָבַנָּה appears to be an intentional replacement of another verb יָעָשָׂה ("to make").

124 Jervell, *Luke*, 51–52.

125 Dahl, "People," 326; Jervell, *Luke*, 52–53.

(cf. 1.4,5; 2.1), which makes the dynasty pure (cf. frgs. 1&3.2.4). On the other hand, Luke would have it that all nations would be taken in when God fulfills his promise to rebuild the tent of David (cf. 15:14, 17). This is how the Lukan James comes to his judgment concerning the fact that the Gentiles should be admitted *qua* Gentiles. This was first seen in Acts 13 by the Lukan reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5, contrary to both the normative text and Luke's interlocutor. Now its fullest implications come in his reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12, fulfilling the reaches of Acts 1:8; 2:39. In conversation with 4QFlor, Luke explicitly disagrees that other nations will bring pollution to the eschatological dynasty. In fact, it is the stance of Luke that the eschatological tent is incomplete without them, since the practice of the church in accepting Gentiles *qua* Gentiles, that has been established since Acts 13 (and directed by God since Acts 10), would not make sense otherwise.

Luke stands against his milieu to say that under the lordship of Jesus, the tent is to be made up of Jews first and then Gentiles who are called by God out of the nations. But, to the reading of 4QFlor and to Conzelmann's question above, Luke says even more clearly that foreigners are to come as they are.¹²⁶ The case for a church of multi-ethnic make-up has been made by Luke to the student of his writing and to his interlocutor. This new reality has been established in the mind of those reading Acts regarding the new ecclesiological make-up of God's people under the lordship of Jesus. From this point onward in Acts, the appeal to the normative text of Scripture becomes nearly nonexistent. Henceforth, the (continued) building of the multi-ethnic tent is the focus of Acts. For Luke, there is no more need for a case to be made. The case has been made for the new church and its new era in the "last days" under the reign of Jesus, the Lord of the day of the Lord. Now, this new reality needs simply to unfold as Acts continues to document.

Indeed, Scripture is the matrix through which Luke makes sense of his context, but specifically, it is the quoted material from the LXX-TP that Luke has chosen to read in order to best exegete the major movements of the "last days" under the lordship of Jesus. This defines his context as a new reality that outlines salvation and being part of the people of God for those in his day into ours.

¹²⁶ Again, this means, according to Acts, they come without circumcision and are not required to follow the stipulations of the synagogue (the Law of Moses, as per Acts 13:38–39).

Reading the Greek Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets in Acts

I What Was This Study About?

Luke is a reader of a unified Book of the Twelve Prophets. He is an active reader with a keen theological sense. We have examined with close attention in this study how Luke read and appropriated this corpus for his context in the book of Acts. We did this with Luke set against a three-fold context: the meaning of the original text and context, the literary context of Acts, and the co-readership of his contemporaries who read the same texts as Luke did.¹ We conclude now with some brief comments on our overall study.

Our study suggests without reservation that Luke read the LXX-TP with a particular agenda. He accomplished this agenda by finding a pattern in the corpus of the Twelve and constructing a theological construal to bring out one key theme in his narrative in Acts. The day of the Lord is the governing theological theme arising from the Twelve, and it is this theme that is adopted and adapted by Luke to reflect his context best historically, literarily, and theologically.

Our overall study is informed by the awareness that the Minor Prophets were at one time contained in one scroll, and quite plausibly according to a growing consensus, read as a theological unity. For Acts, Luke lifts four representative texts from the Twelve to stand in for significant sign-posts of the pattern he reads out of the Twelve. Each of these four quotations builds upon the previous one in order to develop an overall theological landscape that propels the reader of Acts through the narrative. In construal of the greater whole of the Twelve, Luke reads each quotation with a trajectory that firmly establishes the universality of the lordship of Jesus, the Messiah in the expected, and now arrived, day of the Lord.

Beginning at Pentecost with “the anchor” of the Twelve prophets, the prophet Joel, Luke anchors his narrative and budding agenda to the revelation that Jesus is Lord by the outpouring of the Spirit, which implies the day of the Lord has now come. He then develops the redemptive-historical implications of such a claim, leading the reader rapidly and ultimately to Acts 15 and the

1 LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2:17–21; (2) LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42b–43; (3) LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41; (4) LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15:16–18.

Jerusalem Council. At this finale of sorts, the full ramifications of Jesus' lordship are felt by the admittance of the Gentiles *qua* Gentiles into the people of God. From here, the mission to the Gentiles is sent. In sum, the major turning points marked out by the LXX-TP in Acts 1–15 fulfill the original program set in motion by Acts 1:8 and Acts 2:39, that the lordship of Jesus would reach those in Jerusalem, and move to “those who are far off” and “to the end of the earth.”

II Luke and His Co-readers

Our method of a three-way dialectic took seriously the role of Luke as an active reader of Scripture,² the freedom and boundaries (i.e., a give and take) set by the normative text, and the evidence of other readers of the same texts on the same intertextual plane that Luke moves about.³ The student of Acts has unique access to the *Vorlage* of the scriptural text that Luke is quoting,⁴ and by using the three-way dialectic, we sought to gain greater clarity on the textual changes that were clearly due to Luke's appropriation of that text for his context.

When Luke is reading a text, he is not merely reading the text in light of the demands of his own historical and literary context, nor simply the “original context” in mind. However, many intertextual studies appear only to grant these two contexts, at most. Luke is in a dialogue with other readers. Our study

2 The limiting of the volition of the reader and their freedom is where we found it difficult to agree with many of the “exegetes” who would impose upon Luke an “original context” or “original meaning” that would pre-determine how Luke might be using a particular scriptural quotation.

3 For the purposes in this study, we intentionally remained in close proximity to Watson's method of a three-way dialectic that essentially “reads the normative text first” in order that we might properly assess the construal of our two interlocutors, Luke and a conversation partner from his milieu, as a reader of the text ourselves. There were slight departures from Watson with regard to his initial assumption about the determining role of the identity of the interpreting author in their interpretations of a text (i.e., the foundational nature of the Jewishness of Paul). As the Lukan texts were read with care, we felt that more than identity for Luke made it a matter of context (i.e., “the last days,” Acts 2:17). That is, it is best to read Luke as one who read Scripture according to the day he inhabited. Though it is hard to parse out completely the two, the text of Acts and its quotation of Scripture (especially his use of particularly the LXX-TP and the way we believe they are being construed redemptive-historically) was best analyzed, not as a question of Luke being either Jewish or Christian, but as one who stood before or after the work of Christ (and the case of Acts, pre- or post-ascension).

4 For review (section 1.b), Luke is quoting from what is best characterized as a “proto-Alexandrian” text of the Greek Twelve Prophets.

has placed Luke in conversation with four particular co-readers who are reading the same texts as Luke. The greater hermeneutical accuracy brought about by this conversation aided us to home in on the Lukan reading and construal of the LXX-TP.⁵ Looking to a co-reader helped us to evaluate, not necessarily if Luke was reading the Twelve as a unified corpus, but if Luke may or may not be forming a theological agenda faithful to the meaning of the corpus being read by him and others—essentially to answer if Luke is part of a detectable tradition of reading the text at hand. Reading Luke against the backdrop of an intertextual dialogue helps us to see Luke and his milieu with fresh eyes. We are able to locate Luke along the intertextual spectrum in relation to another co-reader. By doing this, we learned about Luke's use of texts.

By and large, Luke can be said to be in theological and hermeneutical agreement with many of his co-readers. Using texts to talk about the messiah, a coming ruler, a day of judgment, or hermeneutical analogies from one era of God's people to another stand out as apparent similarities between Luke and his contemporary readers. One area of disagreement that stands as important is the issue of the lordship of the messiah. Luke's theological reading of the texts to support this important theme stands out as exceptional among readers. The third dimension or third context of a co-reader is thus a vital step in our intertextual exploration and draws Luke out of a hermeneutical vacuum or two-dimensional process of Luke vis-a-vis the OT context.

For our study, in sum, the importance of this co-reader drew out how seriously Luke takes the theme of the day of the Lord, vis-a-vis his contemporaries. That theological concept is the pattern Luke draws out of the grander whole of the Twelve. The pattern is made up of aspects of the lordship of the messiah, the fulfillment of that lordship by a universally offered salvation, and a multi-ethnic people under that lordship. As we look along the spectrum of meaning the Twelve makes available to later readers, Luke inhabits this area of the spectrum consistently, and that is a unique thing among readers in this sense. In the end, each one of these LXX-TP texts has a unique Lukan reading associated with it that moves his narrative and argument forward, building towards a particular construal of the whole of the LXX-TP.

5 Each of these conclusions and the contours of each chapter's argument, cannot be once again outlined here, but the reader should refer to section v of chapters 2–5 for how Luke and his exemplar interlocutor interacted regarding how each one read the same text uniquely and how this throws light on the Lukan argument that is mounted in Acts upon the construal of the LXX-TP.

III How Each Quotation Built towards One Argument

Under investigation were the four quotations of the LXX-TP in Acts. Each quotation was examined in the order that they appeared in Acts in order to best apprehend the Lukan construal of these texts as the narrative of Acts unfolded.

(1) We saw in chapter 1 that LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2, one of the most universalizing texts of the Jewish Scriptures and one that is generally recognized as programmatic for the TP, is used by the Lukan Peter at Pentecost to answer the crowd's question about the meaning of the events (see, e.g., 2:12). He explains them as the wonders and signs that accompany the “last days” as predicted by LXX-Joel 3:1–5 and fulfilled by the ascension of Jesus and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh. One should recognize that the events of Pentecost are exactly those Jesus spoke of to the disciples in Acts 1:6–8 concerning the time at which they would receive the promise, and that LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is the text that Luke uses to explain this thing that Jesus had promised before his ascension.

It has been proposed that the revisionary reading of LXX-Joel 3:1–5 is *not* that Jesus is Messiah, but that Jesus the Messiah *is Lord*. If Jesus was a messiah and not Lord, as Litwak suggests is the revisionary reading, there would not be much that is revisionary about it since this is also the reading of Joel 3 found in *The Testament of Judah* 24.

The appropriation of this text at Pentecost sets the stage for the narrative of Acts and gives subtle clues to its direction (i.e., “all those who are far off,” 2:39, and with its connection to Acts 1:8, the trajectory of that text is relevant). Its main purpose is to demonstrate that the inauguration of the day of the Lord has occurred and that the Lord of that day is Jesus and to suggest that day was of universal significance. The LXX-Psalms quotations (LXX-Ps. 15, 109) are in support of this purpose.

(2) Next (see chapter 2), the use of the text of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 comes at the close of the Jerusalem mission. Fittingly, Luke reads it as the text that marks the beginning first move of the proclamation of the lordship of Jesus and his work outside of Jerusalem. Such a move is contrary to the perception of the temple by Jews in Jerusalem.

It has been argued in this work that Luke's reading of LXX-Amos 5:25–27 makes the golden calf a type of the temple (the LXX-Isaiah 66:1–2 quotation supporting the typology), condemning the idolatry of the perception of the fixed Temple in Jerusalem in Stephen's day. This typology begins to demonstrate that a gulf is widening between those who have answered the call of the Lord Jesus and his universal lordship, and those who have not.

In a similar way to Luke, CD reads Amos 5 in an interpretive analogy to temple issues of its day (i.e., its context) and applies the text in a way that is contrary to a natural reading of Amos 5. *Pace* those like Dunn and Pervo who are seeking a logical chronology from the Lukan use of the same text, reading Amos 5:25–27 as an analogy is a possible way to interpret a difficult passage like this one.

(3) The third quotation in the Lukan construal of the LXX-TP in Acts, LXX-Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13 (see chapter 3), is found at the end of Paul's first speech to the mixed Jewish and God-fearing audience at Pisidian Antioch. It was argued at this point that the reading of LXX-Hab. 1:5 in this context is distinctly Christian, in that, for Luke, "ecclesiological vanishing" (i.e., they are no longer God's people by virtue of not naming Jesus as Lord) comes not by virtue of violence by a people who remain a separate people but by the joyful incorporation of a new people; the LXX-Isaiah 49:6 quotation confirms the words of Paul and the trajectory set by the LXX-Hab. 1:5.

Like Steyn, those who find little use for 1QHab and its interpretation of Hab. 1:5, vis-a-vis the Lukan reading of the same text, cannot fully appreciate how unique Luke is in his interpretation of it and its implications for the redemptive-historical turning point, which LXX-Hab. 1:5 marks in Acts. The reading of LXX-Hab sets the narrative of Acts on a collision course over the question of how the uncircumcised Gentiles are to be rightly included into the people of God, a question that is treated by Luke in Acts 15 with the final LXX-TP quotation.

(4) The final LXX-TP quotation in Acts was covered in chapter 4. The quotations from Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15 is used by the Lukan James to admit the Gentiles *qua* Gentiles in the people of God, as those whom the Lord God had called by his name as a people for his name (cf. 15:14, 17).

Here it was proposed that the Lukan reading of this text is one that sets Luke apart from his reading tradition. The text of LXX-Amos and the context of Acts 15 speaks of a people and their inclusion, and not of a messiah as such, as 4QFlor would have it. In this vein, the Lukan reading of LXX-Amos 9:11–12 is the final word on ecclesiology in Acts, insofar as no further developments concerning the make-up of the people of God and the reach and implications of the lordship of Jesus are added. At this point, the furthest reaches of Acts 1:8 and 2:39 have been met, and the full scope of the day of the Lord, first proclaimed in Acts 2:16–21, is inaugurated.

In summary, the three-way dialectic served our Lukan intertextual study by locating with greater accuracy where Luke fits within an intertextual field. In so doing, we were able to assess with greater clarity where Luke stood in reference

to the theological meaning intended by the normative text, and how he interacted with the theological reading of an exemplar text, which was reading the same text as him. What most importantly was drawn out of this “conversation” is how such a dialogue set the Lukan theological construal of particular texts in greater relief.

By this method, we discovered importantly distinct ways in which Luke read the LXX-TP; the ways were uniquely Christian and seen in the context of the day of the Lord. In sum, according to the construal of the LXX-TP in Acts, those ways would be that (1) Jesus is Lord as YHWH is Lord (LXX-Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2), (2) that his lordship is not fixed but is on the move since it is a universal one (LXX-Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7), (3) that he is the Lord of all people, including of those who have no association with the synagogue and are uncircumcised (LXX-Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13), and (4) that his people are being restored, are made up of all nations *as they are*, and have reached a point of restoration so that the Gentiles could seek out the tent of David. In other words, the Gentile mission could be officially sent by the church (LXX-Amos 9:11–12 in Acts 15). Each one of these LXX-TP texts has a unique Lukan reading associated with it that moves his narrative and argument forward, building towards a particular construal of the whole of the LXX-TP, which is what will be summarized next.

iv What if the Greek Twelve-Prophets Were Not in Acts?

At this point in the study, we will briefly submit the overall contribution of the LXX-TP to our understanding of Acts. However, maybe we could phrase the question in the opposite direction. It could be asked, not “What do the Greek Twelve Prophets add to the narrative of Acts?” or mainly, “How is Luke using the Greek Twelve Prophets in Acts?” but rather, “What if the Greek Twelve Prophets were not in Acts?” If we ask the question negatively, it might be that we will get closer to the heart of our thesis. We proposed that Luke is drawing the Greek Twelve Prophets from a single corpus (again, as opposed to twelve individual prophets), with a single intention, and a single construal.

Early in our study, we looked at the text findings of Utzschneider concerning the place of the Minor Prophets in Acts. Utzschneider’s conclusions consisted of two statements, first, “By and large the findings suggest that the book of the Twelve was not really of great literary and theological relevance for the New Testament authors ...”⁶ and second, “... the New Testament does not consider

6 Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 282.

them as a well-defined, literary, or theological entity.”⁷ Despite Utzschneider’s first observation, we have found that the LXX-TP does hold a place of prominence, theologically, in Acts. Not concerning ourselves with the whole of the NT, we used Utzschneider’s study to show that, despite his second observation, Acts is exceptional in the way it quotes the Minor Prophets, according to word count, text source, its introduction of the TP quotations, and its narrative placement of these quotations. In sum, the Greek Twelve Prophets are essential to Luke in his narrative in Acts and are uniquely quoted by Luke in Acts.

If we asked, “What if the Greek Twelve Prophets were not in Acts?” we would discover that major holes would be found to exist in Acts. Simply put, the LXX-TP are Luke’s “time-keepers” for the day of the Lord. Since, according to LXX-Joel 3:1–5, Jesus is the “Lord and Christ” of “the day of the Lord”, the TP take on a new relevance that they would not have had pre-ascension (i.e., in Luke’s gospel). Indeed, a new day has dawned wherein those texts are fulfilled, of which the prophets foretold. The TP for Acts, therefore, mark out the beginnings of new “acts” in the drama of the unfolding of the day of the Lord in Acts 1–15. And they map the movement of the gospel according to the plan set out by Jesus in Acts 1:8 when, before the ascension, the disciples asked about the kingdom of God.

The disciples’ sights were set too low in 1:6. Jesus had a plan that was much larger. Jesus’ post-ascension plan concerned all of the world in concentric circles and involved all the people who characteristically inhabit those circles: (1) the “Jews of Jews” in “Jerusalem,” (2) the synagogues of “Judea,” (3) the mixed ethnicities of the Samaritans and partial-Jewishness of the God-fearers and proselytes in “Samaria,” and (4) the Gentiles *qua* Gentiles at “the ends of the earth.” As we approach each of the concentric circles that characterize the words of Jesus in 1:8, an LXX-TP quotation appears in order that the next stage of the mission might be known, and so that the extent and implications might be understood. In other words, the quotations appear at recognized milestones in the first fifteen chapters in Acts, chapter 15 being one of the more significant turning points at which the mission of the church takes a decidedly different direction with a different leader and the main character, Paul.⁸

The Lukan reading, appropriation, and quotation of the LXX-TP stand in their narratological setting as hermeneutical lenses through which Luke helps

⁷ Utzschneider, “Flourishing Bones,” 291.

⁸ See the structures of the following commentators, for example, in order to see where they believe the turning points in Acts to be, and the major divisions. They do not all share the same opinion, but in total they point to similar milestones as we have. Cf. e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*; Dunn, *Acts*; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*; Gaventa, *Acts*.

his reader see and understand the context of the “last days” in which all people on earth now stand. As the Lukan James says in Acts 15:15, this is not a matter of opinion; it is the very word of God through the prophets. The “prophets agree” (15:15) that the reality of the day and its trajectory first proclaimed in Acts 2 and now fully realized in Acts 15 is one set in motion by the Lord (15:18) God (15:14) “who made these things known from of old” (15:18). In other words, the plan that Jesus would be Lord (as Joel 3 says) moves beyond the bounds of the land promised to Israel, of Jerusalem in a movable tent, as the Lukan reading of Amos 5 says by its critique of the temple. It extends to peoples who have never felt the freedom of the gospel as they now can by Jesus’ lordship as Hab. 1 points to by its warning of an astonishing “work” of God. The end goal is that these people might be fully associated with the people of God as they are, without circumcision as Amos 9 says.

It is then plausible to suggest that without the LXX-TP, Luke would be missing his most important lenses through which the context of his day and the point in God’s redemptive-historical context would be exegeted. Most importantly, the voice of God, according to the Lukan construal of this corpus, would be missing while around the early church the Holy Spirit is moving in a way that would otherwise be incomprehensible. Luke instead finds the pulse of the Twelve Prophets, according to how he reads it, in terms of the day of the Lord and its implications. Our argument in this study was never for a particular ordering of any extant Minor Prophet MSS, but that Luke reads them in a construed order of Joel, Amos, Habakkuk, Amos. Luke quotes the LXX-TP, according to its unique place among the prophetic corpus, with the purpose of making a case that the day of the Lord is Jesus’ day since he is Lord as YHWH is Lord, that his lordship has universal implications and a universal trajectory, and that these things have been the plan all along. He makes a case for a people of God consisting of a multi-national people, showing that prophecy pointed to this reality, and prophecy was fulfilled by the realization of the plan of Jesus in 1:8 and of the Lukan Peter in 2:39; in short, the earth is the Lord’s and all that is in it as the Psalmist (24:1) says and Paul also repeats (1 Cor. 10:26), and that his mission matches that truth in the inaugurated lordship of Jesus the messiah.

In summary, the agreement of the prophets is the sum total of the Lukan construal of the LXX-Twelve Prophets in the Book of Acts that exegetes his context: the day of the Lord Jesus, his lordship over a new multi-national people, and salvation offered to Jew and Gentile alike as they are.

Appendix

Selected Texts

The Testament of Judah *Chapter 24—English Translation*¹

¹And after this there shall arise for you a Star from Jacob and peace: and a man shall arise from my posterity like the Sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in gentleness and righteousness, and in him will be found no sin. ²And the heavens will be opened upon him to pour out the spirit as a blessing of the Holy Father. ³And he will pour the spirit of grace on you. And you shall be the sons and truth, and you will walk in his first and final decrees. ⁴This is the Shoot of God Most High; this is the fountain for the life of all humanity. ⁵Then he will illumine the scepter of my kingdom, and from your root will arise the Shoot, ⁶and through it will arise the rod of righteousness for the nations, to judge and to save all the call on the Lord.

*CD-A 7:13–8:1—English Translation*²

Ephraim detached itself from Judah, and all the backsliders were delivered up to the sword; but those who remained steadfast ¹⁴escaped to the land of the north. As he said: “I will exile the tabernacle [סכות] of your King ¹⁵and the Kiyun of your images away from my tent [אהל] to Damascus.” The books of the law are the tabernacle [סכות] ¹⁶of the King, as he said “I will lift up the fallen tabernacle [סכות] of David.” The King ¹⁷is the assembly; and the Kiyun of your images are the books of the prophets, ¹⁸whose words Israel despised. And the star is the Interpreter of the law, ¹⁹who will come to Damascus, as is written: “A star moves out of Jacob, and a scepter arises ²⁰out of Israel.” The scepter is the prince of the whole congregation and when he rises he will destroy ²¹all the sons of Seth. These escaped at the time of the first visitation ^{8:1}while the backsliders were delivered up to the sword ...³

¹ English translation from: Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.*, 801.

² This is my translation from the text Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, *DSS SE*, 561.

³ Italics indicate allusions to Amos 5 and 9.

1QpHab. 1.16–2.10⁴

116[... Look, traitors, and behold,]
 17 [be astonished, shocked, for in your time a work is done which you would not believe if]
 21 it was reported. *Blank* [... The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with the Man of
 2 the Lie, since they do not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of
 3 God; and (it concerns) the traito[rs of the] new [covenant] si[n]ce they did not
 4 believe in the covenant of God [and dishonoured] his holy na[me].
 5 Likewise: *Blank* The interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the last
 6 days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe
 7 when they hear all that is going [to happen t]o the final generation, from the mouth of
 8 the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the Commun]ity, to foretell the fulfillment of all
 9 the words of his servants, the prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared
 10 all that is going to happen to his people Is[rael].

4QFlor 1.10–13⁵

והג[יד לכה יהוה כיא בית יבנה לכה והקימותי את זרעכה אחריכה והכינתי את כסא ממלכתו]	10
לעו[לם אני אהיה לוא לאב והוא יהיה לי לבן הוא צמח דויד העומד עם דורש התורה אשר]	11
[בצין] ב[אחרית הימים כאשר כתוב והקימותי את סוכת דויד הנופלת היאה סוכת דויד הנופל[ת] א[שר יעמיד להושיע את ישראל]	12 13

And Yahweh declares to you that he will build you a house [2 Sam. 7:11c].
 “And I will raise up your offspring after you [2 Sam. 7:12b], and I will establish his royal throne forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me

4 The translation is from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, *DSS SE*, 10–13. The brackets in the translation indicate lacuna that are filled by obvious restorations. Cf. also the translation in Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 161–63.

5 Hebrew text and translation draws heavily upon the PTSDSSP as found in Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 250–53.

[2 Sam. 7:13b–14a].” He (is) the Shoot of David who will arise with the interpreter of the Torah⁶ who [...] in Zion in the latter days, as it is written, And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen [Amos 9:11a]. He is the booth of David that is fallen who will arise⁷ to save Israel.

6 See chapter 5 section IV for a note on the variant “works of Torah,” as “works of thanksgiving.”

7 The DSSSE (Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *DSS SE*, 352–53) translation for this phrase is “which he will *raise upto* [*sic*] save Israel” (emphasis mine). Charlesworth’s translation of העמיד is preferable for its consistency, since the quotations used by 4QFlor from 2 Sam 7 and Amos 9, respectively, uses הקים as its language for “rise up,” while the interpretation of 4QFlor twice uses העמיד (both in Hi’fil) to tie these texts to the messianic figure. This issue is discussed in chapter 4 section IV.

Works Cited

- Aitken, James K., ed. *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. New York: T&T Clark, 2015.
- Andersen, Francis I. *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Ådna, Jostein. "Die Heilige Schrift Als Zeuge der Heidenmission: Die Rezeption von Amos 9:11–12 in Apg 15:16–18." In *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche*, 1–23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.
- Ådna, Jostein. "James' Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and the Elders in Jerusalem (Acts 15)." In *Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*, edited by Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein, 125–61. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Balentine, Samuel E. *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: A Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K. *Acts: 1–14*. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004.
- Barrett, C. K. *Acts: 15–28*. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004.
- Barrett, C. K. "Luke/Acts." In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 231–44. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Barth, Marcus. *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1–3*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1974.
- Barton, John. "The Day of Yahweh in the Minor Prophets." In *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart*, edited by Carmel McCarthy and John F. Healey. JSOT. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Barton, John. *Joel and Obadiah: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Bates, William H. "A Note on Acts, 13:39." In *SE*, edited by E. A. Livingstone, 8–10. Berlin: Akademik Verlag, 1973.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13–21)." In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, edited by Ben Witherington, 154–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Jerusalem Church." In *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*, edited by Richard Bauckham, 415–80. Grand Rapids; Carlisle: Eerdmans; Paternoster, 1995.

- Baum, Armin. "Paulinismen in Den Missionsreden Des Lukanischen Paulus: Zur Inhaltlichen Authentizität der Oratio Recta in der Apostelgeschichte." *ETL* 82, no. 4 (2006): 405–36.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove: Apollos; IVP, 2004.
- Ben-Yashar, M. "Noch Zum Miqraš 'Ādām in 4Q Florilegium." *RQ* 10, no. 4 (1981): 587–88.
- Betz, Otto. *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.
- Beyer, Hermann Wolfgang. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947.
- Bird, Michael F. *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Bock, Darrel L. "Kenneth Duncan Litwak, Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the Story of God's People Intertextually." *CBQ* 68 (2006): 152–53.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: JSNT, 1987.
- Bovon, François. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*. Waco: Baylor, 2006.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. "In a Mirror, Dimly—Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times." In *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, 15–31. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Brooke, George J. "The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7:13b–8:1a) and Messianic Expectation." *ZAW* 92, no. 3 (1980): 397–404.
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in Its Jewish Context*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Bruce, F. F. "Habakkuk." In *The Minor Prophets*, edited by McComisky, 831–96. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Budde, Karl. "Eine Folgeschwere Redaktion Des Zwölfprophetenbuches." *ZAW* 39 (1922): 218–29.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Twelve Prophets: Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai*. Translated by John Owen. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1848.
- Chance, J. Bradley. *Jerusalem, The Temple, and The New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon: Mercer: Peeters, 1988.

- Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- Charles, R. H. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: Translated from the Editor's Greek Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908.
- Charlesworth, James H. *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. PTDSSP. Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Charlesworth, James H. "The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity." Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, PTDSSP. Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Canonical Shape of the Prophetic Literature." *Int* 32, no. 1 (1978): 46–55.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Clarke, William Kemp. "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts." In *The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 2: Prolegomena II/Criticism*, eds. Lowther, F. J. Foakes, and Kirsopp Lake, 66–105. London: MacMillan, 1922.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Collins, John J. *Joel, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013.
- Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Collins, John J., and Michael E. Stone, eds. "Testaments." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, 325–55. Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress, 1984.
- Comblin, José. "La Paix Dans La Théologie de Saint Luc." *ETL* 32, no. 3–4 (1956): 439–60.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Gentiles/Jews/Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. London: Faber, 1960.
- Cosgrove, C. H. "Divine DEI in Luke-Acts: Investigations Into the Lukan Understanding." *NovT* 26, no. 2 (1984): 168–90.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Joel*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

- Cripps, Richard S. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos*. London: SPCK, 1969.
- Dahl, Nils. "A People for His Name (Acts XV.14)." *NTS* 4, no. 4 (1958): 319–27.
- Daly-Denton, Margaret. "David the Psalmist, Inspired Prophet: Jewish Antecedents of a New Testament Datum." *ABR* 52 (2004): 32–47.
- Davies, Philip R. "Damascus Rule (CD)." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 2, edited by David Noel Freedman, 8–10. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Davies, Philip R. "The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document." *JJS* 33, no. 1–2 (1982): 287–301.
- de Silva, David A. "Paul's Sermon in Antioch of Pisidia." *BibSac* 151 (1994): 32–49.
- Dillard, Raymond B., and Thomas Edward McComiskey, eds. "Joel." In *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 483–550. Assen; Philadelphia: Van Gorcum; Fortress, 1984.
- Dines, Jennifer M. "The Minor Prophets." In *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by James K. Aitken. New York: T&T Clark, 2015.
- Dines, Jennifer M. "The Septuagint of Amos: A Study of Interpretation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of London, 1992.
- Doble, Peter. "Luke 24.26,44—Songs of God's Servant: David and His Psalms in Luke-Acts." *JSNT* 28, no. 3 (2006).
- Doble, Peter. "The Psalms in Luke-Acts." In *The Psalms in the New Testament*, edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, 83–117. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Dupont, Jacques. "LAOS EX ETHNŌN (Acts XV.14)." *NTS* 3 (1956): 47–50.
- Dupont, Jacques. "La Structure Oratoire Du Discours d'Étienne (Actes 7)." *Biblica* 66, no. 2 (1985): 153–67.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. "The Essene Writings from Qumran." In *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.
- Elliot, Mark Adam. *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Ellis, E. E. "Midraschartige Züge in Den Reden der Apostelgeschichte." *ZNW* 62, no. 1–2 (1971): 94–104.
- Evans, Craig A. "Diarchic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Messianism of Jesus of Nazareth." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress July 20–25, 1997*, edited by James C. VanderKam,

- Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Emanuel Tov, 558–67. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Israel Antiquities Authority, 2000.
- Evans, Craig A. “The Two Sons of Oil: Early Evidence of Messianic Interpretation of Zechariah 4:14 in 4Q254 4 2.” In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Texts, Reformulated Issues, and Technological Innovations*, edited by D. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ, 566–75. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “The Reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran.” In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, edited by Shalom Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields, 241–56. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. *The Interpretation of Prophecy*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1993.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “David, ‘Being Therefore a Prophet ...’ (Acts 2:30).” In *CBQ*, 332–39, 1972.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *To Advance the Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Floyd, Michael H. *Minor Prophets, Part 2*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids; Carlisle: Eerdmans; Paternoster, 2002.
- Franklin, Eric. “Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts.” *SJT* 23, no. 2 (1970): 191–200.
- Frye, Northrop. “Varieties of Literary Utopias.” In *Daedalus*, 323–47, 1965.
- Fuller, Russell. “The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve: The Evidence from the Judean Desert.” In *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts*, edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House, 86–101. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Gaventa, Beverly. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.
- Gempf, Conrad H. “Historical and Literary Appropriateness in the Mission Speeches of Paul in Acts.” UK: The University of Aberdeen, 1988.
- Glenny, W. Edward. *Amos: A Commentary Based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Glenny, W. Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Glenny, W. Edward. “The Relationship of the Two Amos Quotations in Acts.” ETS National Conference. Milwaukee, 2012.
- Glenny, W. Edward. “The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Acts 15.” *BBR* 22 (2012): 1–26.

- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Goodacre, Mark S., and Perrin, Nicholas, eds. *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*. London: SPCK, 2004.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Schriftzitate Und Textüberlieferung in Der Apostelgeschichte." *ZTK* 51, no. 2 (1954): 153–67.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hays, Richard B. "On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, 70–96. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- Hays, Richard B. "Paul's Hermeneutic and the Question of Truth." *PE* 16, no. 2 (2007): 126–33.
- Helberg, Jacob L. "Wat Sê die Boek Amos en Handeling 15:15–17 Oor die 'n Beloofde Land." In *die Skriflig* 33, no. 4 (1999): 567–83.
- Hengel, Martin. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Hengel, Martin. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Hiebert, Theodore. "Habakkuk." In *The New Interpreter's Bible: Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature, Daniel, The Twelve Prophets*, edited by Leander E. Keck, 621–55. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Hiers, Richard. *The Day of the Lord*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. ABD, 82–83. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Hirsh, E. D. *Validity in Interpretation*. Chelsea: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Holladay, Carl R. *Acts: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016.
- Hollander, Harm W., and M. de Jonge, eds. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." In *Outside the Old Testament*, 71–91. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Holtz, Traugott. *Untersuchungen Über die Alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- House, Paul R. *Dramatic Coherence in Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- House, Paul R. *The Unity of the Twelve*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.

- Howard, George E., Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. "To the Reader of the Twelve Prophets." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*, 777–81. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hulst, A. R. "Kol Basar in der Priesterlichen Fluterzählung." In *Studies on the Book of Genesis*. Vol. 12. OTS, 28–66. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *The Book of Amos: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Jervell, Jacob. "The Future of the Past: Luke's Vision of Salvation History and Its Bearing on His Writing of History." In *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, edited by Ben Witherington III, 104–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and The People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1972.
- Jervell, Jacob. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Jervell, Jacob. *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- Jervell, Jacob, Walther Eltester, Christoph Burchard, and Johannes Thomas, eds. "Ein Interpolator Interpretiert Zu der Christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen." In *Studien zu Den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen*. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1969.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts*. Milwaukee: Marquette, 2002.
- Jones, Barry A. "The Book of the Twelve as a Witness to Ancient Biblical Interpretation." In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, 65–74. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Jones, Barry A. *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NT* 4, no. 3 (1960): 182–235.
- Jonge, Marinus de. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin." 171. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.
- Jong-Hoon, Kim. "Intentionale Varianten der Habakukzitate Im Peshet Habakuk Rezeptionsästhetisch Untersucht." *Bib* 1 (2007): 23–37.
- Juel, Donald H. "Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2." *CBQ* 43, no. 4 (1981): 543–56.

- Kee, H. C., and James H. Charlesworth, eds. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century B.C.): A New Translation and Introduction." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1, 775–828. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Introduction and 1:1–2:47*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: 15:1–23:35*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: 3:1–14:28*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013.
- Keener, Craig S. "Why Does Luke Use Tongues as a Sign of the Spirit's Empowerment?" *JPT* 15, no. 2 (2007): 177–84.
- Kelle, Brad E. "Review of The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament." *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*. Michael B. Shepherd. *RSR* 39, no. 4 (2013).
- Kelsey, David. *The Use of Scripture in Recent Theology*. London: SCM, 1975.
- Kilgallen, John J. *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7, 2–53*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Kilgallen, John J. "Unity of Peter's the Pentecost Speech." *BibTol* 82 (1976): 650–56.
- Kilpatrick, G. D., and J. Kremer, eds. "Some Quotations in Acts." In *Les Acts Des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie*, 81–97. Gembloux: Duculot, 1979.
- Kraus, Wolfgang. "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case." In *Translation is Required*, edited by Robert J V. Hiebert, 171–90. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.
- Kugel, James L. "David the Prophet." In *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*, edited by James L. Kugel, 45–55. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Kugler, R. A., Lawrence H. Schiffman, and James C. VanderKam, eds. "Testaments." In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 933–36. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. ENCYC.
- Kuhn, Karl G. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." In *Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by Krister Stendahl and James H. Charlesworth, 54–64. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Henry J. Cadbury, eds. *Additional Notes to the Commentary. The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Macmillan, 1933.
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Henry J. Cadbury, eds. *English Translation and Commentary. The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Macmillan, 1933.
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta. "The Minor Prophets in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period." In *Minor Prophets in the New Testament*, edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken, 7–25. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Levinskaya, Irina. *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Lifshitz, Baruch. "L'Origine Du Nom Des Chrétiens." *VC* 16, no. 2 (1962): 65–70.

- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic. The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Litwak, Kenneth. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Loader, J. A. "Explanation of the Term Prosēlutos." *NT* 15, no. 4 (1973): 270–77.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London: SCM, 1970.
- Loretz, Oswald. "Regenritual und Jahwetag Im Joelbuch." Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1986.
- Luz, Ehud. "Utopia and Return: On the Structure of Utopian Thinking and Its Relation to Jewish-Christian Tradition." *JR* 73, no. 3 (1993): 357–77.
- Mainville, Odette. "Jésus et l'Esprit Dans L'Oeuvre de Luc?: Éclairage À Partir d'Ac 2:33." *Science et Esprit* 42, no. 2 (1990): 193–208.
- Mallen, Peter. *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Acts." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 513–606. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Martinez, Florentino Garcia, and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999.
- Mays, James Luther. *Amos: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Merx, Adalbert. *Die Prophetie Des Joel und Ihre Ausleger von Den Alten Zeiten Bis zu Den Reformatoren*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1879.
- Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York: UBS, 1971.
- Miura, Yuzuru. *David in Luke-Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Morales, Rodrigo J. *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Moyise, Steve. *The Later New Testament Writings and Scripture: The Old Testament in Acts, Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles and Revelation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.
- Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New*. New York: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Moyise, Steve. "Review of The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament." *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*. Michael B. Shepherd. *RBL* 5 (2011).
- Moyise, Steve, and M. J. J. Menken, eds. *Minor Prophets in the New Testament*. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

- Mulroney, James A. E. "Rethinking Habakuk 1:12 in Light of Translation Style and the Literary Character of Ambakoum." *JSCS* 45 (2012): 77–93.
- Mulroney, James A. E. "A Stone Shall Cry Out From a Wall: Studies on the Translational Style of Old Greek Habakkuk." New College: University of Edinburgh, 2014.
- Mulzac, Kenneth D. "Amos 5:18–20 in Its Exegetical and Theological Context." *AJT* 16, no. 2 (2002): 286–300.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Sahat in the Qumran Literature." *Bib* 39, no. 1 (1958): 61–66.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Damascus Document (CD and QD)." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, edited by Craig A Evans and Stanley E Porter, 246–50. Downers Grove: IVP, 2000.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. "The Original Text of CD 7:9–8:2 = 19:5–14." *HTR* 64, no. 2–3 (1971): 379–86.
- Mussner, Franz. "In Den Letzten Tagen (Apg 2:17a)." *BZ* 5, no. 2 (1961): 263–65.
- Neusner, Jacob, William Scott Green, and Ernest S Frerichs, eds. *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Nogalski, James. *The Book of the Twelve: Hosea-Jonah*, 488. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2011.
- Nogalski, James. "The Day(s) of YHWH in the Book of the Twelve." *SBL Seminar Papers*, no. 38 (1999): 617–42.
- Nogalski, James. "The Day(s) of YHWH in the Book of the Twelve." In *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 617–42, 1999.
- Nogalski, James. "Intertextuality and the Twelve." In *Forming Prophetic Literature*, 102–24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Nogalski, James. "Joel as 'Literary Anchor' for the Book of the Twelve." In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, edited by James Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney, 91–109. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Nogalski, James. *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993.
- Nogalski, James. *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993.
- Nogalski, James, and Marvin A. Sweeney, eds. *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Nolland, John. "A Fresh Look at Acts 15.10." *NTS* 27 (1981).
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1–9:20*. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Nolland, John. "Salvation-History and Eschatology." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 63–82. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- O'Toole, Robert F. "Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost." *JBL* 102, no. 2 (1983): 245–58.
- O'Toole, Robert F. "Christ's Resurrection in Acts 13, 13–52." *Bib* 3 (1979): 361–72.

- Padilla, Osvaldo. *The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography*. New York: Cambridge, 2008.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Paul, Shalom M. *Amos*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Acts: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
- Peterson, David. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Philonenko, Marc. *Les Interpolations Chrétiennes Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.
- Pillai, C. A. J. *Apostolic Interpretation of History—A Commentary on Acts 13:16–41*. Hicksville: Exposition, 1980.
- Polhill, J. “Antioch’s Contribution to Christianity.” *Faith and Mission* 18 (2000): 3–20.
- Prato, Gian Luigi. “Idolatry Compelled to Search for Its Gods: A Peculiar Agreement Between Textual Tradition and Exegesis (Amos 5:25–27 and Acts 7:42–43).” In *Luke and Acts*, edited by Gerald O’Collins, Gilberto Marconi, Matthew J. O’Connell, and Emilio Rasco, 181–96. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- Price, Walter K. *The Prophet Joel and the Day of the Lord*. Chicago: Moody, 1976.
- Prinsloo, Willem S. *The Theology of the Book of Joel*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985.
- Rahlf, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Rector, Larry J. “Israel’s Rejected Worship: An Exegesis of Amos 5.” *RQ* 21, no. 3 (1978): 161–75.
- Redditt, Paul Lewis, and Aaron Schart, eds. *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.
- Redditt, Paul L. “The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Review of Research.” In *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, edited by Paul L. Redditt and Aaron Schart, 1–26. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Redditt, Paul L. “The Production and Reading of the Book of the Twelve.” In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, 11–33. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. “Alas for the Day: The ‘Day of the Lord’ in the Book of the Twelve.” In *God in the Fray*, 186–97. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. “How to Read the Book of the Twelve as a Theological Unity.” In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, 75–87. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. “Herkunft und Sinn der Patriarchen-Reden in Den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen.” In *Littérature Juive Entre Tenach et Mischna: Quelques Problèmes*, edited by W. C. van Unnik, 29–47. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Des Lukas*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1969.
- Richard, Earl. “The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts.” *NT* 26, no. 1 (1982): 37–53.
- Richard, Earl. “The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15).” In *SBL Seminar Papers*, 267–82, 1980.

- Riesner, Rainer. *Die Frühzeit Des Apostels Paulus: Studien Zur Chronologie, Missionsstrategie und Theologie*. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Rius-Camps, Josep, and Read-Heimerdinger, eds. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*, Vol. 1—Acts 1:1–5:52. Jerusalem. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.
- Ropes, James H. *The Text of Acts*. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Macmillan, 1926.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ruiz, J. P. *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation 16:17–19:10*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Russell, D. S. "The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC–AD 100." Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Schart, Aaron. *Die Entstehung Des Zwölfprophetenbuchs: Neubearbeitungen von Amos Im Rahmen Schriftenübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Schnabel, Eckhard. *Early Christian Mission*. Downers Grove; Leicester: IVP; Apollos, 2004.
- Schneider, Dale A. "The Unity of the Book of the Twelve." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale, 1979.
- Scholem, Gershom. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism: And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium." *RQ* 10, no. 1 (1979): 83–91.
- Scott, J. Julius. *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Scott, James M. "Luke's Geographical Horizon." In *Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, Vol. 2, 483–544. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Seitz, Christopher R. "Christological Interpretation of Texts and Trinitarian Claims to Truth: An Engagement with Francis Watson's Text and Truth." *SJT* 52, no. 2 (1999): 209–26.
- Shepherd, Michael B. *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Simkins, Ronald. *Yahweh's Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel*. Lewiston: Mellen Press, 1991.
- Sloan, David. "The Understanding of the Psalms in Luke-Acts." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Deerfield: Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2012.
- Smelik, Klaas A. D. "The Meaning of Amos 5:18–20." *VT* 36, no. 2 (1986): 246–48.
- Smith, George A. *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*. Paternoster Row: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

- Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing With Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Stählin, G. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- Steck, O. H. *Der Abschluss der Prophetie Im Alten Testament: Ein Versuch Zur Frage der Vorgeschichte Des Kanons*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.
- Stegemann, H. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Träuer und Jesus*. Freiburg: Herder, 1996.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. "What Did David Understand About the Promises in the Davidic Covenant?" *BibSac* 171, no. 681 (2014): 19–29.
- Stenschke, Christoph. "The Jewish Saviour for Israel in the Missionary Speeches of Acts." In *The Earliest Perceptions of Jesus in Context*, edited by Aaron W. White and Craig A. Evans, David Wenham, 148–62. New York: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- Steyn, Gert. *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995.
- Steyn, Gert. "Trajectories of Scripture Transmission: The Case of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43." *HTS* 69, no. 1 (2013).
- Stowasser, Martin. "Am 5,25–27; 9,11 f. in der Qumranüberlieferung und in der Apostelgeschichte: Text- und Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu 4Q174 (Florilegium) III 12/CD VII 16/Apg 7,42b–43; 15,16–18." *ZNW* 92, no. 1–2 (2001): 47–63.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Strutwolf, Holger, et al. *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior Band III Die Apostelgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *The Twelve Prophets*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. The Acts of the Apostles. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Tanner, J. Paul. "James's Quotation of Amos 9 to Settle the Jerusalem Council Debate in Acts 15." *JETS* 55, no. 1 (2012): 65–85.
- Thompson, Alan J. *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus: Luke's Account of God's Unfolding Plan*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2011.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Tracey, Robyn. "Syria." In *The Book of Acts: Greco-Roman Setting*, edited by David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf, 223–78. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Trull, Gregory V. "Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16:8–11 in Acts 2:25–32." *BibSac* 161, no. 644 (2004): 432–48.
- Trull, Gregory V. "Views on Peter's Use of Psalm 16:8–11 in Acts 2:25–32." *BibSac* 161, no. 642 (2004): 194–214.
- Turner, Max. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.

- Utzschneider, Helmut. "Flourishing Bones: The Minor Prophets in the New Testament." In *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, 273–92. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.
- van de Sandt, Hubertus. Email correspondence, 2015.
- van de Sandt, Hubertus. "An Explanation of Acts 15:6–21 in the Light of Deuteronomy 4:29–35 (LXX)." *JSNT* 46 (1992): 73–97.
- van de Sandt, Hubertus. "The Fate of the Gentiles in Joel and Acts 2: An Intertextual Study." *ETL* 66, no. 1 (1990): 56–77.
- van de Sandt, Hubertus. "The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts." In *Minor Prophets in the New Testament*, edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken, 57–77. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- van de Sandt, Hubertus. "The Quotations in Acts 13:32–52 as a Reflection of Luke's LXX Interpretation." *Bib* 75, no. 1 (1994): 26–58.
- van de Sandt, Hubertus. "Why is Amos 5,25–27 Quoted in Acts 7,42f." *ZNW* 82, no. 1–2 (1991): 67–87.
- Van der Kooij. "The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book." In *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence*, ed. Christopher Tuckett, 53–64. Burlington: Ashgate, 2003.
- van Gemenen, Willem A. "The Spirit of Restoration." *WTJ* 50, no. 1 (1988): 81–102.
- Via, E. Jane. "An Interpretation of Acts 7:35–37 from the Perspective of Major Themes in Luke-Acts." In *Seminar Papers*, edited by Paul Achtemeier, 209–22. New Orleans: SBL, 1978.
- von Eberhard, Begründet, et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th Edition*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
- von Lothar, Ruppert. *Jesus Als der Leidende Gerechte. Der Weg Jesu Im Lichte Eines Alt- und Zwischentestamentlichen Motivs*. Stuttgart: KBW-Verlag, 1972.
- von Rad, Gerhard. "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh." *JSS* 4, no. 2 (1959): 97–108.
- Wall, R. W. "The Function of LXX Habakkuk 1:5 in the Book of Acts." *BBR* 10 (2000): 247–58.
- Walton, Steve. "Kenneth Duncan Litwak, 'Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually.'" *BBR* 17, no. 2 (2004).
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Watson, Francis. *Text, Church, and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Watts, John D. W. "A Frame for the Book of the Twelve: Hosea 1–3 and Malachi." In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, edited by James Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney, 209–17. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Weiss, Meir. "The Origin of the 'Day of the Lord'—Reconsidered." In *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 29–71, 1966.

- White, Aaron W. "The Apostolic Preaching of the Lord Jesus." *Presbyterion* 44, no. 2 (2018): 33–51.
- White, Aaron W. "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts' Reexamined: The Lukan Appropriation of LXX-Amos in Acts and What It Tells Us About Luke." ETS National Conference. Atlanta, 2015.
- White, Aaron W. "Gathered Together: The Grammar of 'Church' from Acts." *Presbyterion* 42, no. 2 (2019), 60–79.
- White, Aaron W. "Whose Gospel is it Anyway?: The Glory of Christ according to Paul's 'My Gospel' and 'Our Gospel' Statements." In *Who Created Christianity: Fresh Approaches to the Relationship Between Paul and Jesus*, edited by Craig A. Evans and Aaron W. White, Peabody: Hendrickson, forthcoming, 2020.
- White, Aaron W. "More Than a Counselor The Longer Reading Isaiah 9:5b in Codex Alexandrinus and Its Hexaplaric Origins." *Adamantius* 24 (forthcoming, 2020).
- White, Aaron W. "Pauline Rhetoric Revisited: On the Meaning of *κολλώμενος* in the Context of 1 Cor 6,12–20." *ETL* 9, no. 4 (2014): 751–59.
- White, Aaron W. "Reading Inclusion Backwards: Considering the Apostolic Decree Again in Fresh Perspective." *BTB* 48, no. 4 (2018): 202–14.
- White, Aaron W. "Revisiting the 'Creative' Use of Amos in Acts and What It Tells Us About Luke." *BTB* 46, no. 2 (2016): 79–90.
- Williams, David John. *Acts*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1990.
- Winter, Bruce W. "The Public Honouring of Christian Benefactors: Romans 13:3 and 1 Peter 2:14–15." *JSNT* 34 (1988): 87–103.
- Winter, Bruce W. *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*. Grand Rapids; Carlisle: Eerdmans; Paternoster, 1994.
- Witherington, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Wolfe, Rolland E. "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve." *ZAW* 53 (1935): 90–129.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Woude, A. S. van der. *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Zeigler, Joseph. *Duodecim Prophetarum*. Septuagint: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum XIII, 2nd. Ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Index of Sources

Old Testament

Genesis

3:22	186n25
4:26	65
6:4	186n25
12:8	65
13:4	65
22:18	11n42
26:4	11n42
28:14	11n42
49:1–27	88
49:8–12	89

Exodus

7:3	76n98
12:29–30	104
12:48	176
14:13	186n25
14:17–18	209
15:6	82
19:5–6	198
22:8	53n179
22:27	15n56
22:28	11n42
22:30	198
32	122
32:23 LXX	115n68
32:28	118n79
33	20
33:7–11	126

Leviticus

26:1	123
------	-----

Numbers

11:10–34	104
11:19	86
11:29	118n79
24:17	90, 129
24:24	168

Deuteronomy

4	20, 109
4:1–28	20

4:1–31	20
4:25–28	108, 192
4:25a	108
4:25b,28	108
4:29–31	109
4:34	76n98
12:11,21	65n54
14:2	197
14:23–24	65n54
16:2,11	65n54
18:5	117
18:15–19	11n42
18:15,18	116
18:18	115
26:18–19	199
28:10	187
28:46	76n98
29:2	76n98
32:7	186n25
32:8–9	199
34:11	76n98

1 Samuel

15:22	107
17:4	91

2 Samuel 209

7	209–213, 227n
7:10–14	208, 208n104, 210–213
7:10b	208n105
7:10b–11	209
7:11	210
7:11a	208n106
7:11c–12b	210
7:12–14	209
7:12c	210n110
7:13 LXX	196
9:11	210

2 Kings

14:28	109n46
-------	--------

Chronicles

17:8–7 LXX	196
22:5 LXX	196

2 Chronicles

2:6	124–125
6:18	124

Ezra

4:7,13,14	92
-----------	----

Nehemiah

1:9	65n54
3:16	81

Psalms

15:8–11 LXX	78, 80–81
15:8 LXX	80
15:10 LXX	80, 97
15 LXX	79–82, 96, 98, 212n117, 220
16	80
17:35 LXX	82
17:36 LXX	196
24:1	224
25:10 LXX	82
40:9	65
43:3 LXX	82
47:10 LXX	82
59:5 LXX	82
74:7	65n54
78:6	65
96:2	65
97:1 LXX	82
98:6	65
106:14	104
109:1 LXX	78, 82
109 LXX	79–80, 82, 82n131, 96, 212n117, 220
110:1 LXX	97
117:16 LXX	82
131:11 LXX	81
135:9	76n98
135:12	199
137:7 LXX	82
144:1	94
144:9	94
144:11,12,13	94
144:18	94
144 LXX	94

Isaiah

1:11–14	107
2:18	123
6:9–10	15, 15n56, 36n132, 162–163, 180
7:17	128
8:18	76n98
10:11	123
10:28–32	151
11	96, 212n117
11:1–4	93
11:4	90
13:20	186n25
16:5	185
16:12	123
19:1	123
21:9	123
25:2	186n25
31:7	123
40:9	65–66
45:21 LXX	205
48:12	186n25
49:6	162, 175, 177, 221
52:7	65–66
52:10	199
57:18–19	84
61:1	65–66
63:9 LXX	186n25
66:1–2 LXX	121, 125, 220

Jeremiah

3:17	65n54
4:5–31	151
7:10–14,30	65n54
7:22	107
7:22–23	105
12:5 LXX	191
12:15 LXX	190
14:9	197
15:15–16	187
31:33–34	60
51:51	208n105

Ezekiel

11:19–20	60
36:25–26	84
36:26–27	60

Daniel		4:15	61
5:4,23	123	4:16	61n35
11:30	168	4:16,17,20	61
		4:16,17,20–21	61
Hosea		4:17–21	64
2:1,25	7n20	4:17,21	61n35
3:5 LXX	59, 190	4:18	64
6:6	7n20	4:21 LXX	76
10:8	7n20		
11:1	7n20	Amos	
13:14	7n20	1:2,14	43
		1:3–5	43
Joel		2:6	105
1–2	43	2:7	105–106
1:2 LXX	68	2:10	109
2:1,15	61n35	2:16	43
2:2	60	3:9–10	105
2:12–27 LXX	59	4:10	105
3	19, 96–97, 220, 224	5:1–6:14	103
Acts 2	19n70, 25, 27–28, 56, 66, 79, 84	5:4–5	103
3:1–5 LXX	1, 41–43, 52, 54–66, 66n56, 110, 177	5:4–5,14	107
Acts 2	14, 27, 38, 66–71, 73, 79–80, 82–84, 86–87, 136, 139, 141	5:4b–5	106
reading the Greek Book-of-the-Twelve- Prophets in Acts	220, 222–223	5:10–12	105
<i>Testament of Judah Chapter 24</i>	88–90, 92–100	5:11	105
3:1–15	12	5:12	105
3:1b–2 LXX	89, 92	5:14	103–104
3:1 LXX	62, 67–68, 72, 86, 89–90, 92, 94	5:14–15	43
3:2	72	5:14–17	104
3:3 LXX	77	5:14–24	104
3:4 LXX	60–61, 76	5:15	108
3:5a	127n109	5:16	104
3:5d LXX	73, 84–86, 93	5:16–17	104
3:5 LXX	7, 43, 61, 65, 84, 89, 93, 187	5:17	103
4	43–44, 61, 64	5:18	44
4:1–17	151	5:18–20	103n9
4:1,16–21	62	5:21–23	105
4:6,8–11	43	5:22–23	106
4:10	64	5:24	107
4:12,14,18–21	61	5:25–26	105–106
		5:25–27a	135
		5:25–27 LXX	1, 12, 14, 17, 20, 53, 103–104, 108–109, 177
		Acts	7:42–43, in 101–103, 110–114, 122–123, 127–128, 144n9, 176, 194, 220, 222
		<i>Damascus Document</i>	128, 130, 133, 135–141, 177

Amos (cont.)

5:25 LXX	102, 105
5:26–27	106, 109, 133–134
5:26–27a	129–131, 130n122, 133, 135–136, 140
5:26 LXX	106–108, 124, 135n143
5:27	107–109
5 LXX	20, 123, 129–130, 132, 192, 221, 224, 225n3

Acts 7, in 102–103, 114, 120,
135–137

6:3	106
6:12	106
8:3,9,11,13	184
8:14	106
9:8	185–186
9:11–12 LXX	1, 14–15, 18, 22, 43, 45, 53, 110, 162, 166

4Q Florilegium

211–212, 216

Acts 15, in 178–180, 182–185,
187–191, 193–195, 197, 199,
201, 204, 206–207

reading of the Greek

Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets

in Acts 214, 221–222

9:11a	129, 184, 190, 209–210, 210n110
-------	------------------------------------

9:11b	195n49
9:11 LXX	7n20, 131, 184, 186, 189, 193–196, 205, 208–215, 208n104

9:12 LXX	7n20, 45, 184–187, 198, 202–205, 211
----------	---

9:13–15	185
---------	-----

9 LXX	20, 22, 53, 194, 209–211, 224, 225n3, 227n
-------	---

Obadiah

15	44
17–18	64
18–21	44
21	44

Jonah

2:1	7n20
-----	------

Micah

4:1	63
4:1–4	63
4:1,2	63
4:2	63
4:3	64
4:3–4	64
4:4	64
7:14 LXX	186n25

Nahum

2:1	66
-----	----

Habakkuk

1	19, 19n70
1:2	149
1:2–4	148
1:5a	152
1:5b	152
1:5 LXX	1, 6n19, 12, 14, 53, 83, 183, 192, 216, 221–222

Acts

13, in 141–150, 144n9,	
152–167, 169–177	
1:6	149
2:4	30, 153
3:2	152

Zephaniah

1:15	61
2:14–17	203

Zechariah

8:3 LXX	190–191
13:1–3	84

Malachi

1:16–17	44
3	44
3:4 LXX	186n25
3:19	44
3:20–21	44
3:20 LXX	90
4:4–6	44

Deuterocanonical Works

Sirach/Ecclesiasticus

49:10 3
50:23 186n25

7:13,8:1 138, 139
7:14 130
7:14–15 129, 130n122
7:15b–16 130
7:16 53
7:17–18 138, 139

*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha:
Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*

Odes of Solomon

31:5 92

The Testament of Judah

1:6 89
3:5–7 91
23:1 92
23:2–3 93
24 52, 88–100, 135, 212n117,
213, 215, 220, 225
24:1 90
24:1,5,6 213
24:2 89, 92
24:3 92–93
24:4 94
24:6 94
24:6b 89, 93

Qumran

Damascus Document

CD 53, 93, 103, 128,
128–129n115
1:14 167n73
7:9–8:21 121
7:15 138, 139
7:18 138
56:9 129
CD–A 92, 134, 136–139, 177
7 17, 134
7:13–8:1 128–130, 133, 135–136,
138–140, 225
7:13–8:1a 129, 225

Pesher Habbukak

1QpHab 166–177, 221, 226
1.10 166
1.13 166
1.16 167
1.16–2.10 53, 166–167, 226
2.1 167
2.1–20 156
2.1,3,5 166
2.2 166, 169
2.4 166
2.5–7 169
2.7–10 169
2.10 169
2.11–6.12 168
3–4 168
4.5,10 168
5.9–12 166
6.1–12 168
7.4–5 166
7.11 208n106
8.1 208n106
8.3 166
9.4–6 168
9.9–12 166
10.9–13 167n73
11.4–8 166
12.4–5 208n106

Rule of the Community 1QS

5.21 208n106
6.18 208n106
9.9–11 93

Samuel Scroll 1Q Samuel 92

9.9–11 93

4Q Florilegium	184, 202, 208–216, 214n121, 221, 227n	10:13 11:31b 13:13 15:18 17:18 18:43 19:37 19:47 20:42 21 21:25a 21:41–44 22:22 23 23:20 23:44–45 23:45 23:47 24 24:36–43 24:44 24:47–49 24:48–49 24:50–51	72 199 196 206 75 75 72 199 13 76 76 78 75 76 7n20 77 77 116n70 26 81 44–45 86 70 81
1.1–2	209		
1.1–9	208		
1.2	209, 211, 214nn120–121, 215n123		
1.4,5	216		
1.7	208m106		
1.10	209, 214n120, 215n123		
1.10–1.13	208–216, 226–227		
1.11	211		
1.12	53, 208–209		
1.12–13	209		
1.13	211		
2.1	216		
10–15	90		
New Testament			
Matthew			
2:15	7n20		
9:1–8	92		
9:13	7		
12:7	7		
12:40	7n20		
Mark			
9:2–10	92		
Luke			
1–2	26		
1:1	69n69		
1:1–4	45, 69n69, 87		
1:2	69n69		
1:10	199		
1:68b	199		
2:29–32	53, 199, 203		
2:32	199		
3:16	85		
4:14,32,36	76		
5:17,24	76, 86n143		
5:26	75		
7:16	75, 199		
9:28–36	92		
9:43	75		
John			
3:8			85
Acts			
1–15			1–2, 197, 203, 218, 223
1:1			69n69
1:1–2			73
1:1–3			45, 69n69
1:1–5			74
1:6–8			126, 146, 220
1:8			2, 53, 70, 81, 86–87, 126–127, 158
Acts			2:39 and 178, 203, 215–216
reading the Greek			
Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets			
in Acts			218, 220–221, 223–224
1:9			81
1:11			116n68
1:20			13
2			12, 43, 117, 143, 155, 177, 202, 214

Joel	3:1–5 LXX in 14, 25–28, 56, 67, 73, 94–96, 98, 100, 139, 141	Acts 1.8	146, 178, 203, 215–216
reading the Greek		reading the Greek	
Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets		Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets	
in Acts	220, 222, 224	in Acts	218, 221, 224
2–3	112, 115, 118	2:40	73–74, 99
2:1	66	2:43	72, 115n65
2:2	66	2:47	75
2:6,38	118n79	3:2	213
2:12	70, 99	3:8–10	75
2:16	12, 28	3:14	117
2:16–20	33	3:14,22–23	115
2:16–21	27, 221	3:15–26	110
2:17–18	79, 86	3:18	75
2:17–21	1, 7, 54–55, 73	3:21	206
2:17–21,39	52	3:22	111n53, 196n54
2:18	70, 72, 79, 86	3:22–23	11n42
2:19–20	83–84	3:23	116
2:22	76, 81, 115nn63,65	3:25	11n42, 203
2:22–23	70, 73–77	3:26	196n54, 201, 213
2:22–36	87	4:21	75
2:22–39	56, 87	4:25–27	199
2:23	75, 81, 83	4:30	72, 115n65
2:24	80–81, 117, 201	5:12	72, 115n65
2:24–31	79	5:38	158
2:24–32	80	6:8	72, 115n65
2:24–35	78–83	6:11	114n62, 115n63
2:24–36	70, 117	6:11–14	112, 114n62
2:24,32	196n54, 213	6:13–14	117
2:27	97	6:13b–14	114n62
2:29	80–81	6:14	162
2:30–31	28	7	11n42, 76, 115–118, 120, 124–125, 176–177, 192–194, 196, 222
2:31,36	79	Amos 5:25:27	
2:32	81, 201	LXX	12, 17, 20, 103, 110, 128, 130, 135–136, 140–141
2:33	117	7:2–8	101n2
2:33–36	82	7:9–16	101n2
2:33,38	117	7:17–43	101n2
2:34	79, 82	7:22	111n53
2:34b–35	97	7:34	199
2:36	28, 79–80, 83, 86, 96–97, 115nn65,67, 116n68	7:35	101n2, 111
2:36–38	119	7:35–37,51–53	192
2:36–41	83–87	7:35–38	110, 115n68, 116
2:37	79, 84	7:35–39	115
2:37–41	70	7:35,38,53	119
2:38–40	84	7:36	72, 115n65
2:38,40	84	7:37	11n42, 115n67, 117, 196n54, 213
2:39	2, 52, 70, 73, 84, 89, 99, 198		

Acts (cont.)

7:37–38	115
7:38	117, 119, 125
7:38–39	118
7:38b–43	20
7:39	116, 118, 124
7:39–44	115n63
7:39,42	192n40
7:40	194
7:40–41	122
7:40–42	122
7:40–43	125
7:40,44	122
7:41	20, 122–123, 195
7:42	12–13, 102, 124, 140, 192–193
7:42–43	20, 101, 110–128, 194
7:42–44	126
7:42b–43	1, 101, 135
7:43	102, 122–123, 192
7:43–44	121
7:44	120–121, 123–124, 126
7:44–50	120
7:45	126–127
7:46	120, 125
7:47	120
7:47–50	120
7:47–53	201
7:48	121–122, 195
7:48–50	120
7:49	195
7:49–50	17, 121
7:51	116–117, 119, 124, 127
7:51–53	118–119, 138
7:52	75, 116, 119
7:53	118
7:55–56	77
8	53
8:32	112
9:22	116n68
10–14	182
10:10–16	204n
10:41	75, 196n54, 201, 213
11	180n2, 216
11:15	204n
11:26	172
13	12, 85, 94, 181, 183, 193–194, 214, 216, 221–222

Habakkuk 1:5 LXX

	141, 143–144, 146, 148, 153–160, 162–163, 165–166, 171, 173, 175–177
13:2	158
13:16	160
13:17	199
13:22	78
13:26	153, 160
13:26–37	156
13:29–39	213–214
13:33,34	196n54, 201, 213
13:38–39	156, 162, 165, 175–176, 204n
13:38–40	164
13:38–41	163
13:39	146, 162
13:40–41	159
13:41	1, 6n19, 142, 153–154, 165, 176
13:42	144
13:42–43	85, 157, 159–160, 177
13:44	161
13:44–47	160
13:44,46–48	192
13:45	161, 163
13:45–46	177
13:45–51	204n
13:46	192–193, 192n40
13:46–47	175
13:46–48	161
13:47	156, 161–162, 203
13:48	163, 173
13:48–50	160
14:3	72, 115n65
14:15	192n40
14:26	158
15	2, 12, 163, 166, 191, 200, 202–203, 212, 215
Amos	9:11–12 LXX
	20, 22, 43, 76, 182–185, 187–188, 193, 195–197, 214
reading the Greek	
Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets	
in Acts	217, 221–222, 224
15:1	162, 204n
15:2	72
15:5	162
15:5–10	163, 165

15:7–10	197	21:21	119
15:7–11	188	23	15n56
15:7,18,21	206	23:5	11n42, 53n179
15:10	164–165, 183, 183n13, 207	28	26, 36n132, 163
15:10–13	199	28:23	162
15:10,14,17,19	204	28:23–24	162
15:10,19	203	28:25–28	204
15:10,19,28	204n	28:25a	163
15:12	115n65	28:26–27	15, 15n56, 180, 188
15:14	189, 194, 197–198, 224	28:28	163
15:14–15	188	28:28b	163
15:14–18	198, 200		
15:14,17	189, 216, 221	Romans	
15:15	200, 224	9:25–26	7n20
15:16	7n20, 12	10:13	7
Amos 9:11–12 LXX			
	179n1, 189–190, 192n40,	1 Corinthians	
	195–197, 201, 203, 215	10:26	224
15:16–17	179	15:55	7n20
15:16–18	20, 22, 179, 191, 194–195,		
	215	Galatians	
15:16–18a	1	2	179–180n2
15:16a	189, 193	2:9	185
15:16b	195, 195n49	3	30–31
15:17	7n20, 20, 189, 194,		
	197–198, 206	Ephesians	
15:18	204–206, 215, 224	2:13,17	84, 199
15:19	192n40		
15:19–21,29	204n	Hebrews	
15:28	188, 197	3:1–6	11n53, 115n63
15:38	158		
16:3	204n	2 Peter	
17:3	116n68	1:17–18	92
17:3,31	196n54, 201, 213		
17:29	125		
19:26	125		

Index of Authors

- Achtemeier, Paul 110
 Ådna, Jostein 180, 182
 Aitken, James K. 13
 Andersen, Francis I. 60, 104, 106–108,
 148–149, 150, 153, 169–170, 184–185
 Aune, David E. 110, 111
- Balentine, Samuel E. 149, 150, 152–153
 Barclay, John M. G. 143
 Barrett, C. K. 67–68, 78, 80, 102, 118–119, 143,
 155–156, 180, 188, 198, 205
 Barth, Marcus 124
 Barthes, Roland 24
 Barton, John 3, 41, 57–58, 61–63
 Bates, Matthew W. 27
 Bates, William H. 163
 Bauckham, Richard 18, 21–23, 180, 188–191,
 193, 195, 200–201, 203–205
 Baum, Armin 156, 164
 Baumgarten, Joseph M. 208
 Beale, G. K. 200
 Ben-Yashar, M. 208
 Betz, Otto 130
 Beyer, Hermann Wolfgang 112
 Bird, Michael F. 62
 Bock, Darrell L. 26–27, 36, 55, 68, 71–72,
 80–83, 110–111, 118, 125, 143, 154–156,
 188–189, 197–198, 202
 Boring, M. Eugene 183
 Bovon, François 14
 Boyd-Taylor, Cameron 13
 Brawley, Robert L. 63, 68, 75, 77
 Brooke, George J. 210
 Bruce, F. F. 145, 159, 201
 Budde, Karl 4
 Burchard, Christoph 89
- Cadbury, Henry J. 67, 75, 128, 180
 Calvin, John 145, 159, 172
 Carson, D. A. 78
 Černý, Jaroslav 104
 Chance, J. Bradley 53, 126, 199, 200
 Charles, R. H. 89
 Charlesworth, James H. 89, 91, 133, 167, 208,
 209, 213, 225–227
- Childs, Brevard S. 24–25, 37, 38, 48, 171
 Clarke, William Kemp 68
 Collins, John J. 58, 89, 90, 92, 93, 208, 209,
 211
 Comblin, José 110
 Conzelmann, Hans 110, 165, 167, 180–181,
 183, 193, 205, 215–216
 Cosgrove, C. H. 75, 76
 Crenshaw, James L. 57, 58, 59–60, 62, 64,
 87
 Cripps, Richard S. 107
- Dahl, Nils 198, 215
 Daly-Denton, Margaret 78
 Davies, Philip R. 129, 131, 132, 134, 138
 Dillard, Raymond B. 60
 Dimant, Devorah 166, 167, 168, 208, 209
 Dines, Jennifer M. 13, 106, 112, 113
 Doble, Peter 36
 Dodd, C. H. 71, 73
 Dunn, James D. G. 102, 110–111, 115, 117, 119,
 122, 136, 156, 221, 223
 Dupont, Jacques 110, 198
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 89
- Elliot, Mark Adam 93
 Ellis, E. E. 71
 Eltester, Walther 89
 Evans, Craig A. 91, 129
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef 167, 168, 169, 170
 Fairbairn, Patrick 205, 206
 Feldman, Louis 143
 Fields, Weston W. 167
 Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 12, 15, 56, 68, 74–76,
 81–82, 85, 101, 110, 117, 119, 126–127, 180,
 188, 193, 205
 Floyd, Michael H. 148
 France, R. T. 66
 Franklin, Eric 57, 69, 82
 Freedman, David Noel 41, 60, 104, 106–108,
 132, 184–185
 Frerichs, Ernest S. 91
 Frye, Northrop 91
 Fuller, Russell 40

- Gaventa, Beverly 82, 83, 85, 110, 115, 207, 223
- Gempf, Conrad H. 74, 143
- Gill, David W. J. 143
- Glenny, W. Edward 11, 13, 101, 104–107, 182, 185–187, 189, 194–196, 200–202, 212
- Goodacre, Mark S. 16
- Green, William Scott 91
- Gressmann, Hugo 104
- Haenchen, Ernst 56, 68, 74, 110, 115–116, 127, 135, 165, 180, 201–202, 223
- Hanhart, Robert 54
- Hays, Richard B. 23–26, 28–29, 32, 38, 48, 49
- Heibert, Robert J. V. 182
- Helberg, Jacob L. 182
- Hengel, Martin 61, 142, 143, 180, 185
- Hiebert, Theodore 151
- Hiers, Richard 41, 60
- Hirsch, E. D. 18
- Holladay, Carl R. 205
- Hollander, Harm W. 90
- Hollander, John 24–25
- Holtz, Traugott 8, 14, 80, 113
- House, Paul R. 3, 40, 42
- Howard, George E. 55
- Hulst, A. R. 62, 63
- Jeremias, Jörg 185
- Jervell, Jacob 16–17, 33, 52–53, 74, 83–84, 89, 102, 110, 115–117, 119–120, 125, 127, 143, 147, 180–181, 183, 185, 194, 200, 202–204, 206–207, 215, 223
- Johnson, Luke Timothy 74–75, 78, 80, 82, 85, 110, 114–116, 118, 143–145, 155, 205
- Jones, Barry Allan 3, 4, 40, 42, 45, 61, 63
- Jonge, Marinus de 88, 90
- Jong-Hoon, Kim 167, 168, 169
- Juel, Donald H. 82
- Keck, Leander E. 151
- Kee, H. C. 89
- Keener, Craig S. 65–66, 74, 85, 110–111, 114, 116–117, 122–123, 126–127, 143, 153–154, 204, 206
- Kelle, Brad E. 5
- Kelsey, David 31
- Kilgallen, John J. 75, 115, 119–121, 127, 139–140, 177
- Kilpatrick, G. D. 55
- Krabel, Thomas 143
- Kraft, Robert A. 167
- Kraus, Wolfgang 13
- Kristeva, Julia 24
- Kugel, James L. 78
- Kugler, R. A. 88
- Kuhn, Karl G. 90
- Kvalbein, Hans 180
- Lake, Kirsopp 67, 75, 128, 180
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta 88, 89
- Levinskaya, Irina 143, 161
- Liftshitz, Baruch 142
- Lindars, Barnabas 71, 118
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan 24–29, 68, 69, 95–96, 98
- Livingstone, E. A. 163
- Loader, J. A. 84, 199
- Longenecker, Richard N. 22–23, 48, 65, 67, 114, 210
- Loretz, Oswald 58
- Luz, Ehud 91
- Mainville, Odette 56
- Mallen, Peter 36
- Marconi, Gilberto 113
- Marshall, I. Howard 1, 16, 74, 78, 86, 102, 122–123, 153, 155, 195, 197–198
- Martínez, Florentino García 169, 208, 225, 226, 227
- Mays, James Luther 60, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward 60
- Menken, Maarten J. J. 10, 14, 19, 36
- Menzies, Robert P. 67, 86
- Merx, Adalbert 62
- Metzger, Bruce 67
- Miura, Yuzuru 36
- Morales, Rodrigo J. 89, 90
- Mowinckel, Sigmund 104
- Moyise, Steve 1, 5, 10–11, 14, 16, 19, 36
- Mulroney, James A. E. 150
- Mulzac, Kenneth D. 103
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome 129
- Mussner, Franz 68

- Neusner, Jacob 91
 Nickelsburg, George W. E. 88
 Nogalski, James 3, 4, 6, 8, 40–43, 57–58, 61
 Nolland, John 77, 86, 155–156, 165, 199, 200
- O'Collins, Gerald 113
 O'Connell, Matthew J. 113
 O'Toole, Robert F. 78, 81–82, 118, 153
 Owen, John 145
- Padilla, Osvaldo 75
 Paul, Shalom M. 103–105, 107–109, 167
 Perrin, Nicholas 16
 Pervo, Richard I. 102, 110, 136, 190
 Peterson, David 155, 188
 Philonenko, Marc 89–90
 Pietersma, Albert 55
 Pillai, C. A. J. 155
 Polhill, J. 161
 Porter, Stanley E. 129
 Prato, Gian Luigi 113, 134
 Price, Walter K. 42–43
 Prinsloo, Willem S. 58
- Rahlf's, Alfred 54
 Rasco, Emilio 113
 Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny 12, 49
 Rector, Larry J. 103, 107
 Redditt, Paul Lewis 3, 40, 42
 Rendtorff, Rolf 3, 40, 41, 42, 43–44, 58
 Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich 89–90
 Rese, Martin 55, 71, 72
 Richard, Earl 1, 11, 19, 68, 147, 182, 189–192, 194–195, 198–199, 214
 Riesner, Rainer 142
 Rius-Camps, Josep 12
 Ropes, James H. 12, 13
 Rowe, Kevin 34
 Ruiz, J. P. 10
 Russell, D. S. 90
- Schart, Aaron 3, 4, 40, 42
 Schiffman, Lawrence H. 88, 91, 129, 167
 Schnabel, Eckhard 74, 142, 143, 161, 204
 Schneider, Dale Alan 3
 Scholem, Gershom 92
 Schwartz, Daniel R. 208
 Schwemer, Anna Maria 142, 143
- Scott, James M. 85
 Scott, J. Julius 89, 92
 Seitz, Christopher R. 32
 Shepherd, Michael B. 4–10, 118, 156
 de Silva, David A. 156, 164
 Simkins, Ronald 58, 60, 61, 62
 Sira, Ben 12
 Sloan, David 36
 Smelik, Klaas A. D. 60
 Smith, George A. 149, 151
 Soards, Marion L. 75
 Stählin, G. 156
 Stanley, Christopher D. 48
 Steck, O. H. 40
 Stegemann, H. 167
 Steinmann, Andrew E. 79
 Stendahl, Krister 90–91
 Stenschke, Christophe 74
 Steyn, Gert 56, 59, 67–68, 71–72, 75–78, 80, 82–84, 86–87, 129–132, 135, 154–155, 164, 171, 173–174, 221
 Stone, Michael E. 89, 92, 166
 Stowasser, Martin 182
 Strauss, Mark L. 118, 200, 202
 Strutwolf, Holger 54
 Sweeney, Marvin A. 3, 39–40, 42, 59–61, 64–65, 151
- Tannehill, Robert C. 71, 75–76, 110, 115, 143–145
 Tanner, J. Paul 182
 Thomas, Johannes 89
 Thompson, Alan J. 34–35, 52
 Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 169, 208, 225, 226, 227
 Tov, Emanuel 9, 91
 Tracey, Robyn 143
 Trull, Gregory V. 78, 80, 81
 Tucket, Christopher 185
 Turner, Max 60, 70, 72, 82–83, 89, 93, 116–118, 124
- Utzschneider, Helmut 4, 8–16, 191, 222–223
- VanderKam, James C. 88, 91
 Van der Kooij 185
 van der Woude, A. A. 90

- van de Sandt, Hubertus "Huub" 10, 14, 16,
 18–22, 55, 57, 62, 66, 80, 85–86, 102, 116,
 126, 137, 143, 154, 156, 158, 161, 181–182
 van Gemeren, Willem A. 58
 Via, E. Jane 117
 von Eberhard, Begründet 54
 von Rad, Gerhard 60, 104

 Wall, R. W. 154, 165
 Walton, Steve 27
 Watson, Francis 3, 4, 24, 29–35, 37–41,
 45–51, 174, 218
 Watts, John D. W. 40, 44
 Weiss, Meir 60
 Wellhausen, Julius 184

 White, Aaron W. 11, 14, 19, 84, 143, 182, 192,
 194, 204
 Williams, David John 74
 Williamson, H. G. M. 78
 Winter, Bruce W. 169–170
 Witherington, Ben III 16, 22, 156
 Wolfe, Rolland E. 4
 Wolff, Hans Walter 58–59, 62, 103–105,
 130–133, 138, 182, 184–185
 Wooden, R. Glenn 13
 Wright, Benjamin G. 55
 Wright, N. T. 211

 Zeigler, Joseph 54, 101, 149

Index of Subjects

1QpHab. *See* Peshier Habakkuk
 1QS. *See* Rule of the Community
 1Q Samuel. *See* Samuel Scroll
 4Q Florilegium 202, 208–216
 Amos 9:11 in 208–211
 Luke, and 211–216
 o76 manuscript 67, 67n62

Aaron 127
 Abraham 30, 101n2
 allegiance 105–106
 Amos 19–20, 43, 52, 103, 103n13, 105, 166, 211
 Amos 5:26–27a in Damascus Document, in the 128–141, 225
 Amos 5:25–27 LXX in Acts 7 111–113
 Amos 9:11 in 4Q Florilegium 208–211
 Amos 9:11–12 LXX in Acts 15 187–207
 Antioch 143–146, 158, 164, 172
 “apocalyptic/apocalyptically” 61, 64, 88, 92, 168–170
 apostles 45, 87, 158

 B. *See* Vaticanus
 Babylonian exile 102
 “backsliders” 129, 138–139
 Balaam 168
 Barnabas 53, 85, 158–161, 182, 194, 206–207
 Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets (TP) 1, 15n57, 41, 101, 179, 191, 217
 See also Minor Prophets
 bribery 105
 building activity of God 194–195

 calf idolatry 112, 120, 122–127, 136, 220
 “Call upon the name of the Lord” 93–94
 CD. *See* Damascus Document
 Chaldeans 149, 151n30, 168
 Christian church, establishment of 201
 circumcision 161, 173, 175–176, 181, 188, 204n, 216n, 224
 “conversational hermeneutic” 31–32
 Conversationalists 23–35
 Council. *See* Jerusalem Council

Damascus 108, 129, 131, 138, 192
 good exile, as a 132–133
 Damascus Document (CD) 53, 93, 103, 128–129n115, 128–141
 David 70, 79–82, 87, 94, 97, 99, 117, 121
 prophecy 94, 96–97
 Psalms, and the 78–83
 reign of 143, 184–187, 196
 tabernacle of 130, 130n125, 132
 Davidic Covenant 81, 81n121
 Davidic dynasty 157, 185, 202–203, 207, 209–214
 “day of the Lord” 34, 41, 44, 52, 64, 73–77, 100, 217, 224
 “last days” 33–34, 36, 52, 66–67, 98–99, 166–170, 172, 216, 220, 224
 dialectic 29–31, 45–49, 218n3, 221
 dialogue 37–38
 divided people 101–141

 Echoes in Paul and Luke-Acts 24–29
 Eden 60
 Edom/Esau 44
 Elijah 44
 Emmaus 44
 eschatology 96, 184–186, 188–189, 194–195, 201, 203–204, 207, 209–212
 Eusebius 142
 exegesis 22, 48n169, 191
 exegetes 17–23, 35, 218n2
 exile 102, 104, 106, 131–133, 140–141, 203, 207
 relocation and 108–109
 See also Sin-Exile-Return
 Exodus, look back to the 103–109
 conclusions on 109, 111–112, 137
 prototypical idols from the Exodus 106–108, 122–124, 133
 sacrifice or allegiance to the Lord? 105–106
 Ezekiel 10

 Flourishing Bones 1–16
 fulfillment 26, 28–29, 51, 53, 57, 69–70, 86–87, 98–99, 116–117

- Gamaliel 158
- Gentiles 53, 127, 144–145, 174–175, 214–215, 218, 221, 223–224
- Antiochene 143, 145
- Gentiles as 147, 156, 164–166, 176–177, 187–189, 192, 193n42, 207, 212, 216
- mission 126, 146, 147n, 156, 158, 162, 165
- gezeraḥ shawah* 114, 131, 210–213
- “God-fearers” 144, 146, 161, 164, 173, 178, 223
- Christian version of 183–184
- God’s plan 35, 57, 75–76, 81, 122, 124, 152–153, 159, 173, 185, 192, 202
- golden calf 113, 113n, 123, 127, 220
- Greeks 168
- Greek version of the TP. *See* Septuagint
- Habakkuk 44, 52, 166, 192
- Habakkuk 1:5 in 1QpHab 171–178
- reading of 166–170
- Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13 153–165
- judgment 147–153
- Hebrew Scriptures 78, 201
- Hosea 7, 7n20, 190
- house 209–211
- 4Q Florilegium, in 209–216
- Amos 9:11, in 209–215
- See also* temple; tent
- idolatry 20, 112–114, 121, 136–137, 177
- calf 112, 120, 122–127, 136, 220
- idols from the Exodus, prototypical 102–104, 106–108, 113n, 126
- Isaiah 4, 11–13, 36, 36n132, 192
- Israel 111–112, 117–126, 137, 177, 207
- exile 102
- history of 101n2, 103–108, 143, 215
- restored 200–201
- J. *See* Jewish texts, early
- Jacob 2, 88, 186
- House of 125, 125n103
- James 194, 197–200, 204, 206–207, 221, 224
- “Exegete,” as the 21–23, 191
- speech, of 180, 182, 188, 188n
- Jeremiah 105, 190
- Jerome 3, 142
- Jerusalem 65, 70, 131–133, 140, 185–186, 220, 223
- Council 158, 180–182, 180n4, 188, 207, 215, 218
- “Jesus” 54–100
- Lord, as 2, 33, 57, 82, 100, 141, 146, 158, 175–176, 221
- Lord of the Day, as 73, 216
- Messiah, as 97, 144, 162–163, 200
- Jewish Scriptures 37, 41, 47, 62
- Jewish texts, early (J) 49–51
- Joel 42–43, 52, 59–61, 64–65, 69, 99–100, 166, 217
- Joel 3:1–5 in *The Testament of Judah* 24
- 88–95
- Joel 3:1–5 in Acts 2 66–87
- John Mark 158
- Jonah 43–44
- Joseph 101n2
- Josephus 111n57
- Joshua 126
- Judah 63, 88, 90, 93–95
- Judea 70, 223
- Kittim 168–170, 173, 175–176
- Kiyyun 106, 129, 133–134, 138
- prophets, as your 131–132
- “Known from of Old” 204–207
- L. *See* Lukan text
- “last days” 33–34, 36, 52, 66–67, 98–99, 172, 216, 220, 224, 227
- “day of the Lord” 34, 41, 44, 52, 64, 73–77, 100, 217, 224
- “traitors in the latter days” 166–170
- Law of Moses 146, 159–166, 173, 176, 181, 214
- Customs of Moses 116–119, 128
- Lukan text (L) 49–51
- Lukan theology 11
- LXX version of the TP. *See* Septuagint
- Malachi 7, 44, 44n160
- Man of Lies 167, 167n73, 169, 173, 175
- Man of Scorn 167n73
- Masoretic Text (MT) 5–7, 15n57, 55n2, 106, 133
- Matthew 29
- Micah 44, 64
- midrash 21, 48, 128–131, 133, 208–209, 212

Minor Prophets 1, 15n57, 18–21, 191, 222–224
See also Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets
 Moloch 106, 122
 Moses 44, 101n2, 102, 110, 112–125, 138, 192
 charge of rejecting God and 115–116, 128
 Moses-Jesus typology 115n63, 117
 Mount Zion 65
 MT. *See* Masoretic Text

 Nabiiim 44
 Nahum 44
 Neofiti I 198
 Nunc Dimittis 199

 Obadiah 43–44
 Odes of Solomon 92
 “oppression of the poor” 105

 Pamphylia 158
 Passover 103, 109, 176
 Paul 25, 29–34, 29n112, 53, 53n179, 180–182, 185, 203
 Paul’s speech 142–146, 143n3, 8, 157–158, 174–176, 192–194, 221
 audience for 159–165
 Pentateuch 4, 11n42, 19–21, 29n112, 30–31, 38, 136, 197
 Pentecost 43, 56, 71–72, 76, 117, 217, 220
 people for my name 197–200
 Peshar Habakkuk (1QpHab) 166–177, 221, 226
 Peter 56, 70, 74–76, 79–85, 182, 197–199, 206–207, 220
 Simeon, as 53, 199–200, 200n70
 Peter’s speech 56, 67, 70, 73–74, 80, 115–116
 Philo 111n57
 Pisidian Antioch 85, 142, 145, 159–160, 172, 177, 221
 promise-fulfillment 24, 27, 37, 79, 82–83, 184, 186, 201, 205
 prophecy 43–44, 57–63, 78–87, 93–94, 96, 103, 110, 116, 135, 147
 prophet 57–61, 67–70, 78–79, 81–82, 86–87, 97, 103–109, 148–152
 “A Prophet like me” 115–116
 proselytes 143n3, 146, 178, 223
 Psalms 4, 11–13, 36, 80, 97–99
 David, and the 78–83
 Pseudo-Philo 111n57

Qumran
 community 167, 170
 texts 5, 15n57, 22, 40, 48n169, 84

 Rabbinic Midrash. *See* midrash
 Raiphan 106, 122, 131
 “raise/raising” 209–211
 See also resurrection; Temple; tent
 rebuilding 189–191, 195–197, 201–202
 “redemptive” 16–17, 31, 46, 52, 68, 76, 97, 144, 152–153, 164, 166, 192, 199
 history in Acts, God’s plan for 146–147, 202–204
 repent/repentant 59, 69–70, 83–87, 100, 107, 150, 177
 Rephan 106, 122, 131
 “restoration” 195–197, 201–202
 future age of 90–92, 94
 resurrection 70, 77–83, 155, 173, 193, 196, 201–203, 213, 215
 returning 189–191, 191n39, 192n40, 214
 “revelation/revealed” 60, 66, 85–86, 147, 150, 152–153, 169, 199, 207, 217
 God’s plan 35, 57, 75–76, 81, 122, 124, 152–153, 159, 173, 185, 192, 202
 God’s word 86, 160, 193, 224
 prophecy 43–44, 57–63, 78–87, 93–94, 96, 103, 110, 116, 135, 147
 Righteous One 112, 117, 121, 141, 194
 Romans 168–169
 Rule of the Community (1QS) 93
 ruling with violence 105–106

 S. *See* Scripture
 sacrifice 105–106
 salvation 66, 66n56, 82, 93–94, 188
 Samaria 70, 223
 Samuel Scroll (1Q Samuel) 92–93
 Sanhedrin 101
 Saul 158
 Scripture (S) 49–51
 construing 39–45
 “self-fulfilling prophecy” 145–146, 155
 Septuagint (Greek; LXX) version of the TP 1, 6, 6n17, 44, 76n98, 195
 SER. *See* Sin-Exile-Return
 sexual immorality 106
 Sikkuth 106, 129–131, 133, 138

- Simeon 53, 199–200, 200n70
 Sinai 117, 122
 Sin-Exile-Return (SER) 88, 89n154, 91, 93
 Solomon 121
 Sons of Truth 92–93
 Spouter of Lies 167n73
 stealing 105
 Stephen 101n2, 110–113, 118–119, 137–140, 194
 charges against 114–128, 114n62
 Stephen's speech 101–102, 113–116, 118, 126, 141, 192
 “Synagogue” 52–53, 142, 144, 146–147, 159, 161–162, 164, 173, 175, 203, 223

 Targum 202
 Teacher of Righteousness 166–169, 173
 Temple 134, 139, 177, 194, 224
 4Q Florilegium, in 209
 destruction of 76
 Israel, of 208
 Jerusalem, in 113, 120, 129, 131, 138–139, 185–186, 200–201, 220
 Men, of 208, 208n104, 106
 national symbol, as 126
 rejecting the 119–127
 system 137–138
 tent as your King 130–131
 tent of David
 eschatological restoration of 189–193
 Gentiles and the 197–204
 nations seek the rebuilt 186–187
 nature of the eschatological in Acts 15:16 200–204
 rebuilding of the tent by God 194–197, 207
 what it is meant to represent, and 184–186
 tent of Moloch 135n143
The Testament of Judah (TJ) Chapter 24 88, 96–99
 Joel 3:1–5 in 88–95, 225
 Luke, and 95–100
 Theodotion 5, 9
 TJ. *See The Testament of Judah*
 Torah 44
 TP. *See Book-of-the-Twelve-Prophets*
 traitors 166–169, 173, 226
 turning good things into evil 106

 Uncial 076 manuscript 67, 67n62
 unforgiven debts 105
 universal plan of the Lord 152–153

 Valley of Decision 64
 Vaticanus (B) 67, 67n62, 106
 violence 105
 ruling with 105–106

 Wicked Priest 167
 wilderness period 102, 102n8
 witness/witnesses 66–87
 “woe-oracle” tradition 103n9
 Woes, book of 103
 “wonders and signs” 115n65, 220
 work(s)
 future, of the Lord 148–152
 God: role of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13, of 153–166
 Gospel for the Nations, as the 154–157
 proper referent, for the 158–159
 their hands, of 119–127
 universal, of the Lord 152

 “yoke” 164–165, 204n
 young men 55n2

 Zechariah 190
 Zephaniah 44